



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2009

No. 49

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 23, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA F. EDWARDS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

### PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, for the past year we have been on an economic roller coaster, with scary turns and falls coming ever faster, making the sinking feeling in the pit of our stomachs even worse.

Along the way, the Federal Government, spurred by the most dire predictions, has taken sweeping actions. Some, like the bailout, I opposed; others, like the Economic Recovery Package of President Obama, I supported.

But action was warranted to help the struggling economy and restore public confidence. Yet we continue to react to part of the problem with partial stop-gap actions.

This week, Congress has an opportunity to deal with the bigger picture and comprehensive solutions as we consider President Obama's budget.

For decades we have been living beyond our means and the environment's capacity to be a dumping ground for toxic waste, and air and water pollution, especially carbon pollution, that is destabilizing the climate, raising global temperature and sea levels, and changing things we rely on, like growing seasons and water supply.

We have been living on borrowed time and borrowed money. The previous administration cut taxes for those who needed help the least, increased spending but avoided long-term investments in education and our infrastructure like roads, bridges and rail.

The day of reckoning is here, accelerated by the global financial meltdown, the causes of which are clearer than the remedies. The sad truth is that the geniuses who figured out how to enrich themselves were clueless about the broader implications. Too much energy, brain power and lobbying has been spent on making money for a few, not on creating underlying economic value for the Nation. We have been left with two starkly different paths: we can muddle on through doing what we have done, only less of it, with a battle over who will take the biggest losses while continuing these past patterns. Given the array of special interests and the history involved, we have a pretty good idea what that path will look like.

The other approach is outlined in the President's budget: tackle comprehensively the challenges of health care, education, the long-term fiscal stability of the United States and global warming and its real costs and danger.

The health care system is the biggest opportunity for savings. We spend more money than anyone else in the world for health care, but ours is a system where Americans are sick more often and die sooner than people in most developed countries and in even some poor ones. It is not just foreign countries that have figured this out, but many American communities provide better health care while spending less money than the Nation as a whole. We as a Nation can do this.

Energy dependence and carbon pollution doesn't just threaten our way of life in the future, it attacks our pocketbook and our communities now. The President's plan will save families money, make America more secure, and protect the planet.

In the middle of the economic meltdown, we shouldn't and we won't raise taxes. But over the long haul, we are going to have to pay our debts and find money for rebuilding and renewing America. There are areas in the budget that point the way, like keeping some portion of the expiring tax cuts on the most well-off and reinstituting the Superfund tax to clean up toxic waste.

Finally, there is the question of tackling unnecessary spending. The President points out agricultural subsidies for the rich agribusiness interests, while shortchanging most farmers and ranchers. There is a way to make more rational our support of agriculture. We need to support him as we all face the question whether Cold War weapons that the military doesn't need, and in some cases doesn't even want, are worth the costs to the American taxpayer.

The path contained in the budget will be the first chance for Congress, the administration, and, most important, the public to weave together the elements of change and reform. There are short-term political risks, to be sure. But the long-term benefits are breathtaking, especially when compared to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3709

continuing the short term, business as usual, unsustainable course that has led us to this point of economic and fiscal disaster.

My hope and prayer is that Congress will be able to meet the President's challenge and work with him to refine his bold budget, treat our problems with the gravity they merit, and the public with the respect that it is due.

#### FRUIT OF THE BAILOUT MANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it is time for a brief history lesson. In the fall of 2008, the Bush administration came running to Congress with an historic ask: \$700 billion with no strings attached to save the country from financial meltdown. At the time I didn't buy it, so I voted against the bailout plan twice. In fact, my distaste for the bailout plan and the unfettered access to taxpayer money that it gave the Treasury Department and the executive branch was so strong that I soon introduced a bill to stop the bailout mania.

It was a simple bill, but it had to be considered by Congress thanks to the way the bailout law had been written. In a nutshell, it would have stopped the second half of the \$700 billion TARP bailout. I introduced it in 2008 and again in 2009. President Bush's request for the second half of the bailout money in early 2009 triggered consideration of my bill. That's when things got interesting.

The week before we considered my bill to stop the bailout, we also considered another bill called the TARP Reform and Accountability Act. Nice name, but what it essentially did was give a tacit thumbs-up on the second half of the bailout and even more wasteful bailouts with taxpayer money of failed automakers. It had some provisions to increase oversight and transparency. But ultimately, it would have expanded the use of taxpayer money for bailouts.

As I look back over the debates from those two days in January and in the ensuing weeks, I found some comments to be rather surprising, especially in light of the news last week about the outrageous bonuses awarded at AIG, a company which received another \$30 billion this month in government bailout cash. The comments and questions from my friends on the other side of the aisle focused on their unwavering trust in the Obama administration's intentions to stop these sorts of executive bonus payments at companies that received bailout money.

During the debate on the anti-bailout measure, my colleague, Chairman FRANK said, "We saw bankers saying I got the money, it's none of your business what we do with it. We saw bonuses given that shouldn't be given. I am confident that the Obama adminis-

tration has learned from that." In his defense, I know that the chairman of the Financial Services Committee does not support these AIG millionaire bonuses, but we can draw a useful lesson from his comments. It's a simple lesson: the Obama administration pledging that there will be no more excessive bonuses does not make it so.

While I regret that my colleague was so gravely mistaken about the Obama administration, I do think that it is important to point out how quickly the new administration's actions have fallen short of its inflated rhetoric.

Let's take a look at some of the other comments made over the past couple of months. Last month, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) trumpeted President Obama's promise to limit executive compensation at bailed out companies. He said, "Today, the President will limit executive compensation for executives of companies that take advantage of taxpayer bailout funds. This is the right thing to do." And in January, Mr. POMEROY of North Dakota defended his vote to give the Obama administration the \$350 billion in bailout cash, "The written pledges of the Obama administration to operate TARP with firm conditions, greater oversight and transparent accountability abide with the conditions passed by the House."

So what exactly did the Obama administration pledge to do? It pledged to ensure that bailed out financial institutions did not go overboard with excessive executive compensation bonuses. Specifically, his National Economic Adviser wrote a letter to Congress on January 12 that stated: "The President-elect is committed to using the full arsenal of tools available to us to get credit flowing again to families and businesses. He will ask his Department of Treasury to put in place strict and sensible conditions on CEO compensation and dividend payments until taxpayers get their money back." He continued: "We will ensure that resources are directed to increasing lending and preventing new financial crises and not to enriching shareholders or executives. Those receiving exceptional assistance will be subject to tough but sensible conditions that limit executive compensation until taxpayer money is paid back."

One of my colleagues, Mr. MCGOVERN, was very encouraged by this letter from the incoming administration. I will read what he said in response to the administration's pledge: "And I should say that the statement by the Obama administration, the statement by Larry Summers, is all very encouraging. It demonstrates a real appreciation of what average people are going through."

I will leave it to the American people to judge how well the Obama administration has stood by its pledge to "limit executive compensation until taxpayer money is paid back," and I will leave it to the American people to judge how well this administration ap-

preciates what average people are going through—unless, of course, you consider people who get million-dollar bonuses for running a massive company into the grounds to be average.

#### SAFE MARKETS DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, with all of the recent talk about unearned bonuses, I want to talk about a bonus that we Americans can give to ourselves and the world. We can do that by approving President Obama's plan to "make clean, renewable energy the profitable kind of energy." Because we can build a clean energy economy by reducing greenhouse gas emissions—carbon pollution—through a market-based system, as the President has proposed, I am today, together with a number of my colleagues, introducing the Safe Markets Development Act.

This legislation will help to ensure that any future market for carbon allowances is not abused by price speculators or undermined by excessive price volatility. This is the first cap-and-trade measure to be filed in this Congress, and it is unique both in responding to concerns about market manipulation, and in its broad support bringing new members and a broader array of interests behind this new idea about how to resolve one aspect of our transition to a cleaner world.

The Safe Markets bill offers an approach that will provide a narrow auction and trading environment for the start-up phase for a cap-and-trade or cap-and-invest system. Experts on commodities markets tell us that price volatility is not unusual with new markets. And certainly legitimate concern recently over speculation in fossil fuel and financial markets must not stand in our way of new clean energy policy.

How does this bill achieve science-based emission reductions? It creates an independent board with strict conflict-of-interest provisions and post-employment restrictions to determine the annual prices per ton of carbon necessary to meet science-based annual emission targets from 2012 to 2020. The Treasury Department would conduct quarterly allowance auctions designed to maintain this price. Under the legislation, the board would conduct an annual review of its success in meeting emission goals in order to adjust for gas prices to ensure compliance with the next year's targets.

Just as a child removes training wheels after becoming comfortable cycling, or tries the shallow end of the pool before moving into the deep end, so too we can gain experience over these first eight years to move eventually to a more traditional cap-and-trade system.

□ 1245

Like President Obama, I believe that the best approach is one that relies

upon a 100 percent auction—that does not give away to polluters “pollute free” cards. Budget Director Dr. Peter Orszag has correctly noted that giving away allowances would represent the largest corporate welfare program that has ever been enacted in the history of the United States. As noted in another recent statement by over 600 economists calling for auctioning all allowances, free allocations do little or nothing to protect families and businesses from higher energy costs. The significant shortcomings of the European cap-and-trade system are largely linked to the pursuit of this politically easy but very ineffective course. An abundance of free allocations just leads to more price speculation and would hinder the ability of the system to properly reduce emissions.

The bill that I am introducing today represents the type of legislation that I will continue offering, building block by building block, to help us achieve a comprehensive solution. Next will be a plan that I will advance to ensure the competitiveness of American importers and exporters in the new energy economy. I am pleased this legislation enjoys support from a number of members of the Blue Dog coalition, such as Representative JIM COOPER and Representative HEATH SHULER, as well as members of other caucuses here in Congress and a broader array of business interests such as the National Venture Capital Association.

Last week, Speaker PELOSI brought together key House committee chairs to sign a statement that they are uniting behind one bill to achieve our shared goal with President Obama of a more accessible, affordable health care system for every American. I believe we need to do the same thing to resolve global warming. Today's bill represents one new element of that broader legislation that must be developed through cooperation and collaboration of the House Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means Committees as well as many other Members.

I believe that a role exists for every Member of this Congress who is willing to work in good faith based on good science to end obstruction and reduce the real threat of global warming. The more Members we bring together, the more successful we will be in enacting the solution that President Obama has offered and move us to a clean energy economy.

#### THE ECONOMIC CRISIS—WHAT LIES BENEATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, our Federal Government has taken drastic measures in the past 6 months, mainly in the form of taxpayer-funded bailouts, in an attempt to put a stop to the complete deterioration of our financial system. Trillions have been spent and companies such as AIG have been

deemed “too big to fail.” But the Wall Street bailouts have proven to not be a sustainable cure to our financial ills. These bailouts constitute an assault on American capitalism and have introduced a large degree of financial hazard into our economic system.

The nationalization of private assets is inherently un-American. With all the money we have spent thus far, we should have been able to stem much of the economic collapse—but we haven't. We have failed to grasp the root of the problem—the unregulated, out-of-control derivatives market.

The recent disclosure that AIG will pay out \$165 million in bonuses to employees of their Financial Products division—the very unit that made bad bets on toxic mortgages and credit default swaps—is wrong. The Federal Government owns 80 percent of AIG and the Treasury and the Federal Reserve has infused more than \$170 billion in taxpayer bailout money trying to rescue this company. As these recent events demonstrate, the administration's plan of recovery by bailout is not working. Bailout after bailout is not a strategy. It's a formula for waste, fraud and abuse of taxpayer funds.

The Federal Government has spent an exorbitant amount of money trying to rescue the economy but it appears to have had little effect. Beyond the \$700 billion for TARP funds, the government has made commitments of more than \$9 trillion and has spent \$2.2 trillion. And there is very little oversight of this money as the case of the AIG bonuses makes clear. This begs the question: What are we getting for our money?

Clearly the real cause of the financial crisis is more than just the bursting of the housing bubble, since over 90 percent of all homeowners are current on their mortgages. A closer look at the root causes of the crisis reveals flawed incentive structures and an inadequate regulatory system that allowed the derivatives market to spiral out of control.

Specifically, the credit default swap market is completely unregulated and it helped spread the risks generated by subprime mortgages to investors and financial institutions around the world. In the U.S. alone, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency reported the amount of outstanding credit derivatives from reporting banks to be \$16.4 trillion just a year ago. Among the G10 countries—the United States, the U.K., Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden plus Switzerland—the amount of outstanding credit default swaps is about \$57 trillion.

Many have called credit default swaps and the larger derivatives market the true culprit in the global financial crisis. Derivatives trading also helped to contribute to AIG's near collapse and it seems as if no amount of money can save AIG at the moment, yet the company has been deemed “too big to fail.” However, no one has de-

fined what “too big to fail” means in the real world.

Beyond just credit default swaps, the Bank for International Settlements—the world's oldest international financial organization headquartered in Basel, Switzerland—reports the total outstanding amount of over-the-counter derivatives to be \$684 trillion. This large amount of outstanding derivatives demonstrates the world financial system could be in a huge amount of additional trouble during this worldwide economic crisis. Since over-the-counter derivatives are negotiated between parties and not on an exchange, the risk of the contract falls on both of the parties. So if one of the parties is not able to meet the terms of the contract, the first party stands to lose as well. With \$684 trillion of outstanding money, we are playing with very hot fire.

As these statistics show, this is a problem not just in the United States but around the globe.

So what is the solution? Let's break up these firms and sell the pieces off or separate the toxic loans and let the free market correct the economy as it was designed. The viable portion of these massive financial institutions can still be salvaged. However, we need to examine their asset sheets to determine how deeply involved each company is in the derivatives market.

There are better options than endless bailouts and the nationalization of private assets in this country. We must put an end to throwing trillions at the wrong source of the problem.

#### WALL STREET BAILOUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his remarks, where he refers to AIG as “too big to fail.” The latest from Wall Street is, well, it's not so much too big to fail, but too interconnected with the rest of financial institutions. “Too interconnected to fail” is the new line. The fact is this: AIG was too well-connected to fail. AIG should have been in receivership, but that would have disadvantaged the richest, most powerful interests in the world.

Now let us look at the new public-private partnership plan being put forward by the Treasury. It involves a thousand times as much money as AIG executives received in bonuses and it would make the American people a thousand times as angry, except for the fact that it is so technical that the American people may not fully understand it.

Here is how it's supposed to work. The taxpayer puts up 94 percent of the money. The taxpayer takes 94 percent of the risk that the assets purchased will end up being worth nothing. Ninety-four percent. And the taxpayer gets 50 percent of the profits. The private

Wall Street interests put up 6 percent of the money, maybe less, and they get 50 percent of the profits. What this will mean is that this new entity that's created, the public-private partnership, will go out and buy these extremely difficult-to-value assets. They're going to overpay for some. They're going to underpay for others. They're going to make money on some. They're going to lose money on others. When they make money, half the profit goes to Wall Street. When they lose money, 94 percent of the loss goes to the taxpayer.

These entities are going to be 94 percent government-owned and financed. At least we're putting up 94 percent of the money. AIG was 80 percent government-owned and when they paid a million-dollar bonus, the country was angry. Well, what about an entity that's 94 percent government-owned? You can be sure this entity will be paying out million-dollar salaries, million-dollar bonuses. I wonder whether the American people will focus on it.

What we have had is a circumstance where so far this government has transferred hundreds of billions of dollars of wealth to Wall Street. But all that money has gone to the big, well-known, publicly traded companies on Wall Street. Well, there is another important tribe on Wall Street, and that is the hedge funds. Now with this new program, we can transfer hundreds of billions of dollars to the right side of Wall Street and hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer equity, taking hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer risk, for the benefit of the left side of Wall Street. Apparently some people think that's what fairness is—massive wealth transfer to both sides of Wall Street.

Now last week we passed a tax bill. That bill has been criticized by Wall Street and the administration. But they've ignored the statements of Lawrence Tribe, the foremost expert on constitutional law, the professor at Harvard Law School, who outlines step by step why that law was constitutional. Now I had problems with the law because it had loopholes in it. It will allow the Merrill Lynch executives to keep their bonuses. It allows million-dollar-a-month salaries. And I will introduce tomorrow what I think is a much more comprehensive effort to say that those who work for bailed-out firms shouldn't get more than a half million dollars a year, that whatever they get in excess to that they ought to return to their companies, and I hope we will have some cosponsors for that bill. But it is very plain from Lawrence Tribe's analysis that the approach we took in this House yesterday is fully constitutional and that the flimsy constitutional arguments that are being made against it hold water only because they're repeated over and over and over again in somber tones by Wall Street and the establishment.

Let me give you another example. Congress, the Republican Congress in 1996, passed a 200 percent excise tax

which is now law, and that excise tax falls on excess bonuses and excess salaries to executives, and it was retroactive, 6 months retroactive from when it was passed and it took effect 6 months earlier. Why does nobody know about this code section with a 200 percent tax on excess compensation? Because it didn't affect Wall Street, so it was not controversial. It affected those who received excess compensation from charitable organizations.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass reasonable limits on executive compensation and to make sure that the taxpayer gets more than half the benefits when we put up 94 percent of the equity.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, contrary lines run parallel; they may never meet. Holding their own, they forever respect equal distance to each other. Contradictory lines are sure to clash because they are determined only by self-direction. A straight line demands everyone to take a side. A curved line, however—however subtle it is—in the end will form a circle and find oneself.

Lord, help us not to be rigid in our own sense of direction or rash in drawing lines for others. Draw us closer to Your presence, Lord, so we may respond to Your influence upon us; and allow us to have Your way with us, both now and forever.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LYNCH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### LEARNING A LESSON FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent Rasmussen poll, two-thirds of the American people have more confidence in their own judgment than they do in Congress. I couldn't agree more, which is why I and many of my colleagues in Congress believe we can learn from the American people.

We can tighten our budgets when times are tough; we can cut out the things we don't need; we can make some difficult choices rather than mortgaging the future of the next generation and threatening Social Security. We should respect the fact that Americans know better how to spend their own money.

Congress doesn't need an expert economist to tell us how to be fiscally responsible. We have millions of American families, small businesses, and homebuilders all across this Nation who are fine examples of leadership and resolve. We should be promoting small businesses to create jobs, not tax their success.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

#### BUDGET CALAMITY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the proposed budget is going to double the national debt. What that means to Joe Sixpack is every American will be responsible for \$70,000 apiece to pay off this massive debt incurred by money-grabbing government. Does anyone know there's a recession going on?

Government cannot spend America into prosperity with somebody else's money. We shouldn't even be borrowing more money during these hard times. The Treasury Secretary says part of the reason government got into this economic mess was government borrowing. Also, government has plans to raise taxes on working citizens to pay for all these fancy projects in the budget.

Americans already pay too much in taxes during this recession. Americans don't want more taxes. Americans don't want to incur more debt. Americans don't want government to spend money it does not have.

Government is taking America's money to reward failure, and sending money to special interest groups.

Meanwhile, Americans are losing their jobs. Americans are tired, weary, and mad about government “ripoffs, payoffs, and layoffs.”

And that’s just the way it is.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Persons in the gallery will refrain from applause.

#### HONORING DAYNA HILTON FOR HER NATIONAL RECOGNITION

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. My constituent, Dayna Hilton, was recently named the 2009 Educator of the Year by the National Fire Protection Association. She has diligently been involved in fire service for 9 years. She currently serves as the Public Fire and Life Safety Educator for Johnson County’s Rural Fire Department in Clarksville, Arkansas, and is an instructor for both the Arkansas Fire Academy and the National Fire Academy.

Dayna encouraged the Rural Fire Department in Johnson County to make fire prevention part of its mission. Now it has a Fire Prevention Division and, thanks to Dayna’s efforts, has received almost \$150,000 in grants and awards for fire prevention efforts.

In addition to serving the State of Arkansas, Dayna has published numerous articles, appeared on several television networks, and recorded educational videos to promote fire and safety on the national level. Dayna owns Firehouse Dog Publishing, and is the published author of Sparkles the Fire Safety Dog.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dayna.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 23, 2009, at 9:40 a.m.:

Appointments:  
Congressional Award Board.  
Health Information Technology Policy Committee.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,  
*Clerk of the House.*

#### COMMUNICATION FROM DEPUTY STAFF DIRECTOR, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from Paul Arcangeli, Deputy Staff Director, Committee on Armed Services:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC, March 19, 2009.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena, issued in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

PAUL ARCANGELI,  
*Deputy Staff Director.*

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

#### NATIONAL BRAIN INJURY AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 178) expressing the need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and support for the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 178

Whereas traumatic brain injury is a leading cause of death and disability among children and young adults in the United States;

Whereas at least 1.4 million Americans sustain a traumatic brain injury each year;

Whereas each year, more than 125,000 of such Americans sustain permanent life-long disabilities from a traumatic brain injury, resulting in a life-altering experience that can include the most serious physical, cognitive, and emotional impairments;

Whereas every 21 seconds, one person in the United States sustains a traumatic brain injury;

Whereas at least 3.17 million Americans currently live with permanent disabilities resulting from a traumatic brain injury;

Whereas traumatic brain injuries may have a life-altering impact on both Americans living with resultant disabilities and their families;

Whereas concussions are serious injuries to the brain and multiple concussions can lead to lifelong disability and death;

Whereas most cases of traumatic brain injury are preventable;

Whereas traumatic brain injuries cost the nation \$60 billion annually;

Whereas the lack of public awareness is so vast that traumatic brain injury is known in

the disability community as the Nation’s “silent epidemic”;

Whereas traumatic brain injury is the signature wound of the global war on terrorism as a result of roadside bombs and blasts;

Whereas the military personnel who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States in such war and who return to the United States with traumatic brain injuries will require additional Federal, State, and local resources;

Whereas there is a need for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury;

Whereas the designation of a National Brain Injury Awareness Month will work toward enhancing public awareness of traumatic brain injury; and

Whereas the Brain Injury Association of America has recognized March as Brain Injury Awareness Month: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of an appropriate month as National Brain Injury Awareness Month; and

(2) urges the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States, Federal departments and agencies, States, localities, organizations, and media to annually observe a National Brain Injury Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am joined by my colleagues in the consideration of House Resolution 178, which expresses support for enhanced public awareness of traumatic brain injury and for designation of National Brain Injury Awareness Month which, for years, has been commemorated annually during the month of March.

House Resolution 178 was introduced by the great Representative BILL PASCRELL of New Jersey, on February 13, 2009, and has the support and cosponsorship of over 90 Members of Congress. The reason for such generous congressional support is the fact that traumatic brain injury impacts nearly 1.5 million Americans a year.

The measure was considered by the Oversight panel on March 10, 2009, and was passed by voice vote with unanimous support from myself and my fellow committee members.

Mr. Speaker, each and every March the National Brain Injury Association of America and its State affiliates come together with other organizations, businesses, schools, and of course those who have survived or sustained

traumatic brain injury and their families, to promote greater awareness and understanding of brain injury.

Mr. Speaker, before consideration of this resolution, how many of us were aware that every 21 seconds an individual in our country sustains a traumatic brain injury, or the fact that among our servicemen and women engaged in the Global War on Terrorism, brain injury has been identified as a "signature wound," usually resulting from roadside bombs and explosive devices.

Often described as a somewhat "silent epidemic," brain injury, whether as a mild concussion or severe enough to result in comatose conditions, certainly deserves the attention of the Congress and the resources and research of this country.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I'd like to again thank my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman BILL PASCRELL, for working to make sure we recognize the need for greater public awareness of brain injury and for highlighting the National Brain Injury Awareness Month which, this year, I should add, will focus specifically on brain injury in sports and youth recreational activities.

House Resolution 178 is certainly worthy of the support of this body, and I hope my colleagues will vote accordingly.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AKIN. I yield such time as he may consume to a highly respected and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yielding to me. I am honored to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), as well as my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), in speaking in favor of this resolution to express the important need for increased public awareness of traumatic brain injury, and to designate March as National Traumatic Brain Injury Awareness Month.

For the past 4 years, I have been honored to cochair the Congressional Traumatic Brain Injury Task Force with my good friend, Representative PASCRELL from New Jersey. While it's been a pleasure to work with BILL for the last 4 years, I especially want to highlight his great leadership long before I joined the task force—for many years—leading the cause and helping to raise awareness about this important issue.

Together, we have worked to increase awareness of TBI, which many people do not realize is the leading cause of death and disability among children and young adults in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this year alone, over 1.4 million people will sustain a traumatic brain injury. Sadly, at least 80,000 of these individuals will remain permanently disabled from the trauma.

Falls, motor vehicle crashes, sports injuries, and violence are among the

major causes of TBI, leaving every individual susceptible. Additionally, TBIs can manifest themselves in various ways, from small behavioral changes to more tragic injuries, including complete physical disability and death.

Brain injuries affect the whole family emotionally and financially, often resulting in huge medical and rehabilitation expenses. The recent tragic death of Natasha Richardson amplifies the importance of bringing awareness to this critical issue. Because Ms. Richardson appeared to be unaffected immediately after a skiing accident in which she hit her head, she did not receive medical treatment. Unfortunately, only hours later, after experiencing a severe headache, she was admitted to the hospital, lapsed into a coma and, tragically, died. Tragedies such as these happen every day and can often be prevented.

TBI has also been named the "signature wound" of the war in Iraq, with approximately more than 20 percent of our deployed men and women returning with this injury. Thanks to the state-of-the-art body armor with which our men and women overseas are equipped, they are able to survive violent attacks while still receiving a blunt force to the head.

Fortunately, in recent years, Congress and the administration have worked together to provide increased funding for military TBI screening and treatment programs. However, more still needs to be done.

Mr. Speaker, because all of our fellow citizens have families, friends, and neighbors who could fall victim to TBI at any time, I strongly urge support from all of our colleagues for this resolution here today, and urge a "yes" vote.

□ 1415

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at this time I take great pleasure in recognizing the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Massachusetts, and my good friend TODD PLATTS who is the co-chair of the Traumatic Brain Injury Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, I learned about this injury about 10 years ago when I was approached by one of my constituents, Dennis Benigno, whose son was struck by a car, leaving him with severe cognitive and physical disabilities.

In response, former Congressman Jim Greenwood from Pennsylvania and I formed the Congressional Brain Injury Task Force to further education and awareness of brain injuries and support funding for brain injury research. There wasn't too much at that time. In fact, most of the Members of Congress didn't know about the seriousness of the injury and how 1.5 million Americans are affected every year.

I think people often wonder why we spend so much time talking about brain injury. Unfortunately, it took

the war to crystallize what this entire issue is all about.

Someone in America suffers a traumatic brain injury every 21 seconds. At least 1.5 million Americans sustain this injury, as I mentioned. That is more than breast cancer, HIV, multiple sclerosis, and spinal cord injuries combined. Of those, 50,000 will die every year. An estimated 3.22 million Americans are currently living with a long-term disability because of TBI. As many as 20 percent of the 1.8 million deployed troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, that is 360,000 soldiers, have sustained TBIs in Iraq and Afghanistan. That is an astonishing figure.

TBI is one of the rare afflictions that is widespread among both the civilian population and among our soldiers. There has been a weakness in the Defense health care system, and many injured soldiers weren't receiving the level of care that they deserved. The military has made great strides in the last several years to better prevent, identify, and treat brain injuries among our brave men and women in uniform, and Congress has been a willing partner in the effort to ensure sustained progress on this front.

Mr. Speaker and my good friend from Massachusetts, just today on the USA Today front-page review: GI's at Risk By Fitness Practices. Many of the soldiers are not fit to go to the battlefield. Many of our football players in colleges and in high schools throughout America are not fit to go on to the field. If they are not screened, we are doing an injustice to the cause.

Accordingly, the Brain Injury Task Force brought together experts from all over the world at St. Joseph's Regional Medical Center in Paterson, New Jersey, in October for the International Conference on Behavioral Health and Traumatic Brain Injury. These experts generated recommendations that were presented to the Congress 2 weeks ago.

We cannot forget that, for these Wounded Warriors and their families, the war will not end when the last shots are fired. Despite the staggering statistics and heart-shattering stories that come to us from Iraq and Afghanistan, public awareness continues to lag and TBI remains a silent epidemic plaguing our Nation.

Traumatic brain injury can strike anyone and leave devastating results. We probably all know someone or know the story of someone whose life was irreversibly changed because of a brain injury. Just last week we saw a flurry of media accounts of the tragic death of actress Natasha Richardson, who sustained a brain injury while skiing. If that tragedy taught us anything, it is that, as far as science has come, we still know relatively little about this pervasive injury.

The Congressional Brain Injury Task Force continues to seek increased funding for the programs authorized by the Traumatic Brain Injury Act, after an unprecedented amount of congressional support in these recent years.



Designating a month to recognize the prevalence and the seriousness of brain injuries among both civilians and military community will bring much needed public attention to this frequently forgotten malady.

And I might add, Mr. Speaker, that this Wednesday throughout the day, from 10 in the morning until 2 in the afternoon, in the Rayburn building we will have a fair with twice as many displays, close to 50 displays; and then we will have the leading folks from the military and civilian talk about it in the Cannon Building from 3:30 to 4:30, and then in the evening a reception. We are bringing the military and civilians together in order to help our soldiers and help Americans.

This resolution will honor the families who, day in and day out, care for and love their family members who have afflictions, and do so without fanfare, without applause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LYNCH. I grant the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. They do it because they love their sons or daughters or brothers or sisters each day of every month. I invite all Members and the staff to join Wednesday in the Rayburn foyer to meet some of the folks as we recognize Brain Injury Awareness Month here on Capitol Hill. We are hosting a fair with hundreds of individuals from the brain injury community.

Let's pass this resolution to confirm congressional commitment to promoting awareness, education, prevention, and research by reminding all Americans of those individuals and families who suffer from a brain injury.

We have come a long way, Mr. Speaker, in ten years. We could have fit the amount of people in our caucus in a phone booth. That has all changed. We are now close to 125, 130 Members from both sides of the aisle. We are really seeing results, particularly in the last 3 or 4 years.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I want to thank my friend from Pennsylvania. Of course, this is only the beginning of a fight where we will respond, and our men and women who put their lives on the line will know that we really mean what we say, that we love them and we will do everything we can for them.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last week, the devastation of traumatic brain injury was once again brought to our attention with the death of actress Natasha Richardson. This tragedy was but one type of traumatic brain injury that brings about death or physical debilitation to over 1.4 million people each year.

While the leading cause of traumatic brain injury is the result of falls, they are followed by automobile accidents, being struck by or against a hard surface, and assault. Men are at the greatest risk of brain injury, and African Americans have the highest death rate

from this injury. All of these cold, hard facts do not tell the story of shattered lives of the individual, if they survive, and untold heartache and lifelong impact on loved ones and friends of the injured. In America, there are 125,000 citizens living with life-long disabilities from traumatic brain injuries.

These head injuries come about in many ways, not the least of which are the injuries sustained by our soldiers fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. The cost in lives and the ongoing suffering is tragic for these brave men and women. Their injuries will continue to require costly medical assistance from State, Federal, and local agencies.

Generally, a concussion is a type of traumatic brain injury that is caused by an injury to the head that many people underestimate. It is critical to recovery that any type of blow to the head, whether it is a child's fall from a swing to a teen sport or automobile accident, be taken seriously. Often, symptoms don't show up immediately, so keeping a close watch on the injured person is imperative so that medical attention can be sought, if needed.

We are grateful for organizations such as the Brain Injury Association of America who are invaluable in generating understanding and awareness of brain injury. We join with all who wish to broadcast a message of hope and action of this often underestimated condition during March, which has been designated as the National Brain Injury Awareness Month.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to point out the relentless work done on this issue of traumatic brain injury by Mr. PASCRELL from New Jersey, who is the chair, and also by Mr. TODD PLATTS from Pennsylvania, who is the co-chair. I have accompanied both of those gentlemen, I have seen their work in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have seen the situation in Balad, in the field hospitals in Iraq, as well as the military hospital at Landstuhl, Germany, the military hospital there, as well as going back to Walter Reed Army Hospital. They know full well the extent of this. They are our most outspoken advocates on behalf of families whose loved ones have been affected with TBI, and we are all indebted to their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support the measure of Mr. PASCRELL of New Jersey and Mr. PLATTS of Pennsylvania and support House Resolution 178.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 178.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## STAN LUNDINE POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 918) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 East 3rd Street in Jamestown, New York, as the "Stan Lundine Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 918

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. STAN LUNDINE POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 300 East 3rd Street in Jamestown, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Stan Lundine Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Stan Lundine Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in my role as chair of the House Subcommittee with oversight authority of the United States Postal Service, I am pleased to stand before the body in consideration of H.R. 918, which is the measure before us that is designed to rename the United States postal facility located at 300 East Third Street in Jamestown, New York, as the Stan Lundine Post Office Building.

This legislation was introduced by my friend BRIAN HIGGINS, the gentleman from New York, on February 9, 2009, and it was considered and reported out of the Oversight Committee by voice vote on March 10, 2009. In addition, H.R. 918 enjoys the support of the entire sitting New York House delegation.

A native of the city of Jamestown, Stanley Nelson Lundine has devoted over four decades of his life to public service in New York State. Born in Jamestown on February 4, 1939, Mr. Lundine graduated from Jamestown High School in 1957. He received his B.A. from Duke University in 1961, and in 1964 received his juris doctorate from New York University School of Law. Only 5 years after gaining admission to the New York State bar, Mr. Lundine was elected to his first term

as mayor of Jamestown, having previously served as the city's associate corporate counsel and chairman of the City Planning Commission.

As mayor of his beloved hometown until 1976, Mr. Lundine dedicated his efforts to addressing long-standing labor strife in the city. To this end, he developed a unique labor-management strategy, and subsequently garnered Jamestown national attention as a widely successful labor-management partnership model, a model that we could dearly use today.

In 1976, Mr. Lundine was elected to represent New York State's 39th Congressional District, becoming the first Democrat to hold that seat since 1874. While representing New York's southern tier district in Congress until 1987, Mr. Lundine continued his commitment to labor-management cooperation through the development of legislation to establish labor-management councils and employee stock ownership plans. Mr. Lundine also remained dedicated to economic development issues, serving as a subcommittee chairman of the House Banking Committee.

In 1986, Mr. Lundine was elected to statewide office as lieutenant governor of New York, under Governor Mario Cuomo, serving until 1994.

□ 1430

Mr. Lundine worked to further develop the State's economy and increased the availability of job training programs and also strengthened New York's housing and technology sectors.

Currently Stan Lundine serves the citizens of New York State through his continued public service on a wide variety of nonprofit, private sector efforts. Notably, in April of 2007, Mr. Lundine was appointed as chair of the State's newly created Commission on Local Government Efficiency and Competitiveness. The panel is tasked with promoting local government collaboration and efficiency in the name of saving taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor Stan Lundine's decades of public service through the passage of this legislation to designate his hometown post office in his name. I urge my colleagues to join with me and Congressman BRIAN HIGGINS, who is the chief sponsor of this legislation. And I ask my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 918.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 918, legislation to designate the post office in Jamestown, New York, as the "Stan Lundine Post Office Building." Stan Lundine is one of Jamestown, New York's most steadfast public servants. He served as mayor of Jamestown, as a United States Representative and as Lieutenant Governor of New York. A Jamestown native, Stan Lundine was elected mayor of his hometown in 1970, just 6 years after graduating from New York University School of Law. Realizing his success as a mayor, the people

of New York's 39th District elected Lundine to the House of Representatives in 1976. In his five terms as congressman from New York, Lundine continued to focus on labor/management issues. In the Congress, he focused on finance and banking servicing as subcommittee chairman of the House Banking Committee.

After his House career, he was elected Lieutenant Governor of New York under Mario Cuomo and served New York working on housing, technology, and economic development initiatives, as well as training and programming policies. Putting his labor management skills to use, he now serves as a director of the National Forge Company, U.S. Investment Services, and John Ullman Associates. He also serves as executive director of the Chautauqua County Health Network, a group of four hospitals and their physicians dedicated to improving the local health care delivery system in his community.

In recognition of Congressman Stan Lundine's contributions to the country, the State of New York and the city of Jamestown, let us now commemorate his 25 years of public service by naming the post office in his hometown of Jamestown, New York, as the "Stan Lundine Post Office Building."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to thank my colleague for his generous remarks. And I do want to give great credit to Congressman BRIAN HIGGINS from the Buffalo area. He is the central sponsor of this measure to name this post office after Stan Lundine, who is very deserving of this honor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 918.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### LANCE CORPORAL DREW W. WEAVER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1218) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1218

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. LANCE CORPORAL DREW W. WEAVER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 112 South 5th Street in Saint Charles, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I present for consideration H.R. 1218, a bill to designate the United States postal facility located at 112 South 5th Street in St. Charles, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building." This legislation was introduced on February 26 by my colleague and friend, Representative TODD W. AKIN of Missouri, and considered and reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee by a voice vote on March 10, 2009. Additionally, H.R. 1218 enjoys the support of the entire Missouri congressional delegation.

A native of St. Charles, Missouri, Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver bravely served with the 3rd Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force out of Twenty-Nine Palms, California. On February 21, 2008, the young marine was killed in action in al Anbar province in Iraq while conducting combat operations in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Born on July 5, 1987, Lance Corporal Weaver decided to join the United States Marine Corps shortly before his graduation from St. Charles West High School in 2005. He was best known for his positive attitude, his sense of humor, his love of adventure, and above all, his dedication and commitment to his family, his friends, his unit and his country.

St. Charles West Assistant Principal Scott Voekl remembers seeing Lance Corporal Weaver take daily morning runs on Zumbuhl Road near the school in preparation for boot camp. Upon the young man's return from basic training, Mr. Voekl asked him if serving in the Marines was what he wanted to do. "Absolutely," replied Lance Corporal



Weaver. Ken Mayer, another St. Charles West administrator, recalls that Lance Corporal Weaver "truly believed in what he was doing." And St. Charles Mayor Patti York noted that Lance Corporal Weaver was a "true hero" and a beloved member of the St. Charles community.

Mr. Speaker, Lance Corporal Weaver's life and service stand as a testament to the strength and support of his devoted family as well as the bravery and dedication of the young men and women that have joined him in offering the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our Nation.

It is my hope that we can honor this outstanding soldier through the passage of this legislation without objection. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting Congressman AKIN in his sponsorship of H.R. 1218.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I rise in strong support of H.R. 1218, a bill I introduced to honor the life of Drew W. Weaver by designating the post office in St. Charles, Missouri, as the "Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver Post Office Building."

A resident of St. Charles, Missouri, Lance Corporal Drew W. Weaver was part of the 3rd Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, 1st Marine Division, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force.

On February 21, 2007, Lance Corporal Weaver died while conducting combat operations in the al Anbar province of Iraq. As Captain Mark C. Brown noted, Drew was "known for his enthusiasm and his ability to motivate people around him."

Drew's contribution to his country was honored by his community when hundreds, maybe more than hundreds actually, showed up for his memorial service and procession. A graduate of St. Charles West High School, friends and family of Drew remember him as an energetic young man who was eager to serve his country. Ryan Hanson, his best friend and a fellow serviceman, said, "Drew loved what he was doing and was proud of what he did for the Marine Corps."

As a father of two marines, one of whom has served in Iraq and in Fallujah, it is a privilege to stand here today to honor one of our fallen soldiers. Drew's commitment and dedication to his country is a shining example of how our military men and women are the finest our Nation has to offer. His and his family's sacrifice should serve as a reminder to all that the freedom we enjoy as Americans is not always free but the result of tremendous bravery and selfless service of men and women willing to put themselves in harm's way for freedom's cause.

As Reverend James Benz noted during Drew's funeral, "I think we can learn from them that the freedom we enjoy in this country is precious, that it is special, and that it must be preserved sometimes at great personal cost."

Our Nation will be forever indebted to Lance Corporal Drew Weaver.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in honoring Lance Corporal Drew Weaver. Vote "yes" on H.R. 1218.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of our Members to join with the gentleman from Missouri in supporting this bill, H.R. 1218.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1218.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MASSA) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 918, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1218, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### STAN LUNDINE POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 918, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 918.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—396

Abercrombie	Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.
Aderholt	Davis (KY)	Jones
Akin	Davis (TN)	Jordan (OH)
Alexander	Deal (GA)	Kagen
Altmire	DeFazio	Kanjorski
Andrews	DeGette	Kaptur
Arcuri	Delahunt	Kennedy
Austria	DeLauro	Kildee
Baca	Dent	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilroy
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind
Baird	Dicks	King (IA)
Baldwin	Doggett	King (NY)
Barrett (SC)	Donnelly (IN)	Kingston
Barrow	Doyle	Kirk
Bartlett	Dreier	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Barton (TX)	Driehaus	Kissell
Bean	Duncan	Klein (FL)
Becerra	Edwards (MD)	Kline (MN)
Berkley	Edwards (TX)	Kratovil
Berman	Ehlers	Kucinich
Berry	Ellsworth	Lamborn
Biggert	Emerson	Lance
Bilbray	Eshoo	Langevin
Bilirakis	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Fallin	Larson (CT)
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Latham
Bishop (UT)	Filner	LaTourette
Blackburn	Flake	Latta
Blumenauer	Fleming	Lee (CA)
Blunt	Forbes	Lee (NY)
Boccheri	Fortenberry	Levin
Boehner	Foster	Lewis (CA)
Bonner	Fox	Linder
Bono Mack	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Boozman	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Loeb
Boustany	Fudge	Lofgren, Zoe
Boyd	Gallegly	Lowe
Brady (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas
Bright	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brown (GA)	Giffords	Lujan
Brown (SC)	Gingrey (GA)	Lummis
Brown-Waite,	Gohmert	Lungren, Daniel
Ginny	Gonzalez	E.
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Lynch
Burgess	Gordon (TN)	Mack
Burton (IN)	Granger	Maffei
Butterfield	Graves	Maloney
Buyer	Grayson	Manzullo
Calvert	Green, Al	Markey (CO)
Camp	Green, Gene	Markey (MA)
Campbell	Griffith	Marshall
Cantor	Guthrie	Massa
Cao	Hall (NY)	Matheson
Capito	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Capps	Halvorson	McCarthy (CA)
Capuano	Hare	McCarthy (NY)
Cardoza	Harman	McCaul
Carnahan	Harper	McClintock
Carney	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Carson (IN)	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Carter	Heinrich	McDermott
Cassidy	Heller	McGovern
Castle	Hensarling	McHenry
Castor (FL)	Hergert	McHugh
Chaffetz	Herseth Sandlin	McIntyre
Chandler	Higgins	McKeon
Childers	Hill	McMahon
Clay	Himes	McMorris
Clyburn	Hinchey	Rodgers
Coble	Hinojosa	McNerney
Coffman (CO)	Hirono	Meek (FL)
Cohen	Hodes	Meeks (NY)
Cole	Holden	Melancon
Conaway	Holt	Mica
Connolly (VA)	Honda	Michaud
Conyers	Hoyer	Miller (FL)
Cooper	Hunter	Miller (MI)
Costa	Inglis	Miller (NC)
Courtney	Inslee	Miller, George
Crenshaw	Israel	Minnick
Crowley	Issa	Mitchell
Cuellar	Jackson (IL)	Mollohan
Culberson	Jackson-Lee	Moore (KS)
Cummings	(TX)	Moore (WI)
Dahlkemper	Jenkins	Moran (KS)

Moran (VA) Rogers (KY) Speier  
 Murphy (CT) Rogers (MI) Spratt  
 Murphy, Patrick Rooney Stearns  
 Murphy, Tim Ros-Lehtinen Stupak  
 Murtha Roskam Sutton  
 Myrick Ross Tanner  
 Nadler (NY) Rothman (NJ) Tauscher  
 Napolitano Roybal-Allard Taylor  
 Neugebauer Royce Teague  
 Nunes Rumpersberger Terry  
 Nye Rush Thompson (CA)  
 Oberstar Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS)  
 Obey Ryan (WI) Thompson (PA)  
 Olson Salazar Thornberry  
 Oliver Sánchez, Linda Tiahrt  
 Ortiz T. Tiberi  
 Pallone Sanchez, Loretta Tierney  
 Pastor (AZ) Scalise Titus  
 Paul Schakowsky Tonko  
 Paulsen Schauer Towns  
 Payne Schiff Turner  
 Pence Schmidt Upton  
 Perlmutter Schrader Van Hollen  
 Perriello Schwartz Velázquez  
 Peters Scott (GA) Visclosky  
 Peterson Scott (VA) Walden  
 Petri Sensenbrenner Walz  
 Pingree (ME) Serrano Wamp  
 Pitts Sessions Wasserman  
 Platts Sestak Schultz  
 Poe (TX) Shadegg Waters  
 Polis (CO) Shea-Porter Watson  
 Posey Sherman Watt  
 Price (GA) Shimkus Waxman  
 Price (NC) Shuler Weiner  
 Putnam Shuster Welch  
 Radanovich Simpson Wexler  
 Rahall Sires Whitfield  
 Rangel Skelton Wilson (OH)  
 Rehberg Slaughter Wilson (SC)  
 Reichert Smith (NE) Wittman  
 Reyes Smith (TX) Wolf  
 Richardson Smith (WA) Woolsey  
 Rodriguez Snyder Wu  
 Roe (TN) Souder Young (AK)  
 Rogers (AL) Space Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—35

Adler (NJ) Engel Pascrell  
 Boswell Farr Pomeroy  
 Boucher Grijalva Rohrabacher  
 Brady (PA) Gutierrez Sarbanes  
 Braley (IA) Hoekstra Schock  
 Brown, Corrine Johnson (IL) Smith (NJ)  
 Clarke Johnson, Sam Stark  
 Cleaver Kosmas Sullivan  
 Costello Lewis (GA) Tsongas  
 Davis (AL) Marchant Westmoreland  
 Dingell Miller, Gary Yarmuth  
 Ellison Neal (MA)

□ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LANCE CORPORAL DREW W. WEAVER POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1218.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1218.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 399, noes 0, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

## AYES—399

Abercrombie Dahlkemper Johnson, E. B.  
 Ackerman Davis (CA) Jones  
 Aderholt Davis (IL) Jordan (OH)  
 Adler (NJ) Davis (KY) Kagen  
 Akin Davis (TN) Kanjorski  
 Alexander Deal (GA) Kaptur  
 Altmire DeFazio Kennedy  
 Andrews DeGette Kildee  
 Arcuri Delahunt Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Austria DeLauro Kilroy  
 Baca Dent Kind  
 Bachmann Diaz-Balart, L. King (IA)  
 Bachus Diaz-Balart, M. King (NY)  
 Baird Dicks Kingston  
 Baldwin Doggett Kirk  
 Barrett (SC) Donnelly (IN) Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Barrow Doyle Kissell  
 Bartlett Dreier Klein (FL)  
 Barton (TX) Driehaus Kline (MN)  
 Bean Duncan Kratovil  
 Becerra Edwards (MD) Kucinich  
 Berkley Edwards (TX) Lamborn  
 Berman Ehlers Lance  
 Berry Ellsworth Langevin  
 Biggart Emerson Larsen (WA)  
 Bilbray Eshoo Larson (CT)  
 Bilirakis Etheridge Latham  
 Bishop (GA) Fallin LaTourette  
 Bishop (NY) Fattah Latta  
 Bishop (UT) Filner Lee (CA)  
 Blackburn Flake Lee (NY)  
 Blumenauer Fleming Levin  
 Blunt Forbes Lewis (CA)  
 Boccheri Fortenberry Lewis (GA)  
 Boehner Foster Linder  
 Bonner Foss Lipinski  
 Bono Mack LoBiondo  
 Boozman Franks (AZ) Loebach  
 Boren Frelinghuysen Lofgren, Zoe  
 Boucher Fudge Lowey  
 Boustany Gallegly Lucas  
 Boyd Garrett (NJ) Luetkemeyer  
 Brady (TX) Gerlach Lujan  
 Braley (IA) Giffords Lummis  
 Bright Gingrey (GA) Lungren, Daniel  
 Broun (GA) Gohmert E.  
 Brown (SC) Gonzalez Lynch  
 Brown-Waite, Goodlatte Mack  
 Ginny Gordon (TN) Maffei  
 Buchanan Granger Maloney  
 Burgess Graves Manzullo  
 Burton (IN) Grayson Markey (CO)  
 Butterfield Green, Al Markey (MA)  
 Buyer Green, Gene Marshall  
 Calvert Griffith Massa  
 Camp Guthrie Matheson  
 Campbell Hall (NY) Matsui  
 Cantor Hall (TX) McCarthy (CA)  
 Cao Halvorson McCarthy (NY)  
 Capito Hare McCaul  
 Capps Harman McClintock  
 Capuano Harper McCollum  
 Cardoza Hastings (FL) McCotter  
 Carnahan Hastings (WA) McDermott  
 Carney Heinrich McGovern  
 Carson (IN) Heller McHenry  
 Carter Hensarling McHugh  
 Cassidy Herger McIntyre  
 Castle Herseth Sandlin McKeon  
 Castor (FL) Higgins McMahon  
 Chaffetz Hill McMorris  
 Chandler Himes Rodgers  
 Childers Hinchey McNerney  
 Clay Hinojosa Meek (FL)  
 Clyburn Hirono Meeks (NY)  
 Coble Hodes Melancon  
 Coffman (CO) Holden Mica  
 Cohen Holt Michaud  
 Cole Honda Miller (FL)  
 Conaway Hoyer Miller (MI)  
 Connolly (VA) Hunter Miller (NC)  
 Conyers Inglis Miller, George  
 Cooper Inslee Minnick  
 Costa Israel Mitchell  
 Courtney Issa Mollohan  
 Crenshaw Jackson (IL) Moore (KS)  
 Crowley Jackson-Lee Moore (WI)  
 Cuellar (TX) Moran (KS)  
 Culberson Jenkins Moran (VA)  
 Cummings Johnson (GA) Murphy (CT)

Murphy, Patrick Rogers (MI) Spratt  
 Murphy, Tim Rooney Stearns  
 Murtha Ros-Lehtinen Stupak  
 Myrick Roskam Sutton  
 Nadler (NY) Ross Tanner  
 Napolitano Rothman (NJ) Tauscher  
 Neugebauer Roybal-Allard Taylor  
 Nunes Royce Teague  
 Nye Rumpersberger Terry  
 Oberstar Rush Thompson (CA)  
 Obey Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS)  
 Olson Ryan (WI) Thompson (PA)  
 Oliver Salazar Thornberry  
 Ortiz Sánchez, Linda Tiahrt  
 Pallone T. Tiberi  
 Pastor (AZ) Sanchez, Loretta Tierney  
 Paul Scalise Titus  
 Paulsen Schakowsky Tonko  
 Payne Schauer Towns  
 Pence Schiff Turner  
 Perlmutter Schmidt Upton  
 Perriello Schrader Van Hollen  
 Peters Schwartz Velázquez  
 Peterson Scott (GA) Visclosky  
 Petri Scott (VA) Walden  
 Pingree (ME) Sensenbrenner Walz  
 Pitts Serrano Wamp  
 Platts Sessions Wasserman  
 Poe (TX) Sestak Schultz  
 Polis (CO) Shadegg Waters  
 Posey Shea-Porter Watson  
 Price (GA) Sherman Watt  
 Price (NC) Shimkus Waxman  
 Putnam Shuler Weiner  
 Radanovich Shuster Welch  
 Rahall Simpson Wexler  
 Rangel Sires Whitfield  
 Rehberg Skelton Wilson (OH)  
 Reichert Smith (NE) Wilson (SC)  
 Reyes Smith (TX) Wittman  
 Richardson Smith (WA) Wolf  
 Rodriguez Snyder Woolsey  
 Roe (TN) Souder Wu  
 Rogers (AL) Space Young (AK)  
 Rogers (KY) Speler Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—32

Boswell Grijalva Rohrabacher  
 Brady (PA) Gutierrez Sarbanes  
 Brown, Corrine Hoekstra Schock  
 Clarke Johnson (IL) Slaughter  
 Cleaver Johnson, Sam Smith (NJ)  
 Costello Kosmas Stark  
 Davis (AL) Marchant Sullivan  
 Dingell Miller, Gary Tsongas  
 Ellison Neal (MA) Westmoreland  
 Engel Pascrell Yarmuth  
 Farr Pomeroy

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1905

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 146, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 252

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 252.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

# NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUES- TION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas, The Hill reported that a prominent lobbying firm specializing in obtaining defense earmarks for its clients, the subject of a "federal investigation into potentially corrupt political contributions," has given \$3.4 million in political donations to no less than 284 Members of Congress.

Whereas, multiple press reports have noted questions related to campaign contributions made by or on behalf of the firm; including questions related to "straw man" contributions, the reimbursement of employees for political giving, pressure on clients to give, a suspicious pattern of giving, and the timing of donations relative to legislative activity.

Whereas, Roll Call has taken note of the timing of contributions from employees of the firm and its clients when it reported that they "have provided thousands of dollars worth of campaign contributions to key Members in close proximity to legislative activity, such as the deadline for earmark request letters or passage of a spending bill."

Whereas, CQ Today specifically noted a Member getting "\$25,000 in campaign contribution money from [the founder of the firm] and his relatives right after his subcommittee approved its spending bill in 2005."

Whereas, the Associated Press also noted that Members received campaign contributions from employees of the firm "around the time they requested" earmarks for companies represented by the firm.

Whereas, clients of the firm received at least \$300 million worth of earmarks in fiscal year 2009 appropriations legislation, including several that were approved even after news of the FBI raid of the firm's offices and Justice Department investigation into the firm was well known.

Whereas, the persistent media attention focused on questions about the nature and timing of campaign contributions related to the firm, as well as reports of the Justice Department conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions, raise concern about the integrity of Congressional proceedings and the dignity of this institution.

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That

(a) the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or a subcommittee of the committee designated by the committee and its members appointed by the chairman and ranking member, shall immediately begin an investigation into the relationship between the source and timing of past contributions to Members of the House related to the raided firm and earmark requests made by Members of the House on behalf of clients of the raided firm.

(b) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall submit a report of its findings to the House of Representatives within 2 months after the date of adoption of this resolution.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Arizona will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

## THE ADMINISTRATION ISN'T PROTECTING AMERICANS' JOBS

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in 2006, Senator Obama told his colleagues, "We need an electronic verification system that can significantly reduce the employment of illegal workers, and give employers the confidence that their workforce is legal."

E-Verify is the voluntary Federal program that does just that by allowing employers to check the employment eligibility of their newly hired employees. Yet the Democrats have blocked every single attempt made so far this year to enact a long-term extension of E-Verify.

Instead of protecting jobs for U.S. citizens and legal workers, President Obama signed a bill that will provide 300,000 jobs to illegal immigrants in just the construction industry alone.

With 12 million Americans out of work, we should save jobs for American workers and legal immigrants, not give jobs to illegal workers.

## ECONOMIC 9/11

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our President, the administration, for the bold action they took today to help resolve our economic morass that we are expressing because of the past administration and the lack of regulations by this Congress. The stock market responded positively with a 500-point gain.

I think it's important that people recognize the good that the administration is doing and trying to do, that we need to work together as a team, as Americans.

After 9/11, Republicans and Democrats came together to support the President and support us in a great crisis. This is an economic 9/11. People should support the President and not do critical things.

Some of them have even suggested, oh, he had time to fill out his NCAA bracket, where he correctly had the Memphis Tigers going to the Sweet Sixteen. There's nothing wrong with that. President Obama is good on the Sweet Sixteen, and he's good on the economy.

## COMMENDING KEVIN PETERSEN

(Mr. MCCARTHY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of a committed public servant, Kevin Petersen, who retires April 3, 2009, as director of NASA's Dryden Flight Research Center located in my district. Kevin has served at Dryden for 38 years and is currently NASA's longest-serving field center director.

Kevin began his career at Dryden as a university cooperative student in 1971, was hired as an aerospace engineer when he graduated from Iowa State in 1974, and later received a Master of Science degree from UCLA.

Kevin was appointed to be Dryden's director in 1999. His tenure as director has seen Dryden's focus on aeronautics research expand to also support work in environmental and space science, space exploration, and human spaceflight. Currently, Dryden has the important task of testing the new Orion Launch Abort System. I appreciated Kevin showing me around that key program when I visited.

Kevin Petersen is a role model for all American students considering a career in science, technology, engineering or mathematics. Kevin, you've been a great public servant. I appreciate your dedication, and I wish you the best of luck.

## CHIEF MARK McCURRY: FIRE CHIEF OF THE YEAR

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Fire Chief Mark McCurry of Forest City, North Carolina. Chief McCurry was recently named Fire Chief of the Year by the North Carolina Association of Fire Chiefs. It is their highest honor.

Thirty-five years ago, Mark's uncle encouraged him to go into the family business of fire service. Now, 35 years later, Chief McCurry is still serving the community of Forest City. He says putting his life on the line to protect those of his fellow citizens is "like a calling."

Chief McCurry understands that his men no longer just put out fires. All Forest City firemen are now certified EMTs and trained to deal with hazardous materials and weather emergencies.

Mark McCurry recently said, "It takes a crazy person to run into a building that everyone else is running out of." I think we all agree, but no, Chief, it takes an extraordinarily brave man to run into a burning building. And this year, your peers have recognized you as the bravest of all. Congratulations.

□ 1915

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## EARLY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, this week I will be introducing the EARLY Act: The Breast Cancer Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009. The EARLY Act is designed to empower young women to learn the facts, know their bodies, speak up for their health, and embrace support.

Despite the perception, young women can and do get breast cancer. More than 10,000 women under 40 are diagnosed with breast cancer every year in the United States. Although the incidence of breast cancer in young women is much lower, young women's breast cancers are generally more aggressive, are diagnosed at a later stage, and result in lower survival rates.

Additionally, certain ethnic groups, including Ashkenazi Jews and African American young women, have an increased risk of breast cancer.

I became acutely aware of all of this information, and more, a little more than a year ago. After finding a lump in my breast while doing my routine breast self-exam in the shower, I learned a few weeks later from my doctor that I had breast cancer.

Upon learning of my diagnosis and after genetic counseling, I also decided to have a blood test that would show whether I had a genetic mutation in the BRCA1 or BRCA2 gene. As a woman of Ashkenazi Jewish descent, I was in a category of at-risk populations for these gene mutations. The test results showed that I did indeed carry the BRCA2 genetic marker that suggests a greater susceptibility to breast and ovarian cancers.

After further consultation with my doctors and my husband, I decided to have a double mastectomy and have my ovaries removed to reduce the likelihood of a recurrence of cancer. Today, with a clean bill of health and cancer-free, I plan to introduce the EARLY Act.

The EARLY Act encourages young women to be familiar with the look and feel of their breasts. By knowing what feels normal, a young woman has a better chance of knowing when something feels different.

The EARLY Act will also work to educate young women about changes in their body that could be warning signs of breast cancer. We want them to know that it doesn't only start with a lump. It can be swelling, a rash, breast pain, nipple pain, redness or scaliness, too.

The EARLY Act will encourage young women to be their own voice—to speak up for themselves and know when they need to go to their doctor.

The EARLY Act will teach both young women and medical professionals alike about risk factors, warning signs of breast cancer, and predictive tools such as genetic testing, that can help women make informed decisions about their health.

It will also provide grants to organizations dedicated to supporting young women and the unique issues we face when diagnosed with breast cancer, as well as managing and understanding their risks.

Today, we often fail to teach about risk in this country. As a result, many of us face serious consequences in our lives. We need to change the educational dialogue and empower not only young women, but everyone to take control of the risks they face. And that begins with education and awareness.

I thought I knew all of my personal risk factors for breast cancer. Because of those risk factors, I performed self-exams, went to my doctor regularly, and have been a longtime legislative advocate in the fight against breast cancer. But when I was diagnosed, I found out I had more risk factors than I was aware of.

For example, I had absolutely no idea that as an Ashkenazi Jewish woman, I was five times more likely than the general population to have an altered BRCA1 or BRCA2 gene, or what the risks of carrying that gene entailed.

This bill will give all young women the tools they need to take control of the risks by teaching awareness of their personal risks and what they can do to manage those risks.

At the end of the day, the old saying rings true: Knowledge is power. By making sure young women know their risk factors, the EARLY Act is the first step in transforming how we approach the fight against breast cancer.

In hearing my story, some people might say I was lucky. While I was certainly fortunate enough to have access to good health care, I didn't find my tumor early because of luck. I found my tumor early because of knowledge and awareness. I knew I should perform breast self-exams, and I was aware of what my body was supposed to feel like.

It is my hope that by sharing my story we will pass the Breast Cancer Education and Awareness Requires Learning Young Act of 2009 into law this year and further reduce the death rate of young women diagnosed with breast cancer.

We need to ensure that every young woman in America can rely on more than just luck. Their survival depends on it.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this vital legislation. Thank you very much.

## HONORING AN AMERICAN ANIMAL-LOVING CHAMPION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, my family and I have always been pet lovers. In fact, we have always been owned by at least one cat and one dog. We support many animal rescue organizations. The current dog and cat we have are both rescue pets. However, we cannot hold a candle to a person whose life has been dedicated to saving animals.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great American, a woman with a passion for the humane treatment of animals, my friend, Gertrude Maxwell. Gertrude Maxwell is the founder, past president, and lifetime chairman of Save-A-Pet of Illinois, which she founded more than 35 years ago. Later, she founded and served as president of Save-A-Pet of Florida. Then, 15 years ago, she started the National Save-a-Pet Foundation, where she currently serves as director and chairman.

Her Save-A-Pet organization exists for one reason—saving animals. It is a nonprofit group dedicated to saving abandoned, homeless, or lost pets, and is committed to shielding pets from the practice of animal euthanasia.

Gertrude is a champion of abandoned and unwanted pets and, as a fellow animal lover, I am inspired by her pioneering work with Save-A-Pet. When she discovered in 1972 that more than 90,000 pets were destroyed every month in the United States, she set about the work of shrinking and hopefully one day eliminating the number of pets euthanized in America.

Throughout her lifetime of work on behalf of animals, Gertrude has established and maintained many animal hospitals and adoption centers. Thanks to her unwavering commitment to saving pets, her work has directly saved nearly 100,000 pets over the course of her decades-long campaign on behalf of animals.

After more than 35 years of advocacy for animals, she is still working for the humane treatment of animals. Her tireless efforts also find her lobbying for laws to aid animal welfare, and recently bore fruit when the Save-A-Pet Act was signed into law in Florida last spring.

This legislation creates what is known as a Direct Support Organization that will raise funds from individuals, corporations, and small businesses to provide grants to animal shelters in emergency situations. This organization will provide for spaying and neutering of abandoned cats and dogs, reduce the need for euthanasia of animals, and reduce animal cruelty.

The Save-A-Pet Act was widely supported by Governor Charlie Crist and organizations like the Florida Veterinary Medical Association; the Florida Association of Kennel Clubs; the Florida Animal Control Association, and the National Rifle Association.

Gertrude has received over 200 awards and honors for her dedication to defenseless and vulnerable animals in America. Today, I honor this outstanding woman for a lifetime of selfless service to her community and for her love for animals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### TARP FUND RECIPIENTS EXERCISE NO RESTRAINT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, the American people were justifiably outraged by news that American International Group—AIG—would be paying out \$165 million in bonuses. AIG would be rewarding its employees for helping the economy post a record \$62 billion loss—and it would be doling out these bonuses while dipping its hands in the taxpayer till.

When a company is 80 percent owned by U.S. taxpayers and it has accepted \$173 billion in Federal bailout funds, the American people expect more.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, with the start of a new week, the U.S. taxpayer is hit with reports of another “TARP-funded corporation gone wild.”

ABC News reported that JPMorgan Chase, a bank that has received \$25 billion in TARP funds, is moving ahead with a \$138 million plan to buy two brand new, luxury corporate jets. The bank will also build a lavish corporate aircraft hangar to house the new jets. According to JPMorgan Chase architects, the new hangar will even be built with a vegetated roof garden.

Mr. Speaker, why can't these TARP beneficiaries get a clue? Where does it end?

Last fall, I voted against the \$700 billion government bailout because U.S. taxpayers should not have to pick up the tab for the poor business decisions of high-flying Wall Street firms.

Let's not forget—no more than a week after Congress passed this \$700 billion bailout, AIG spent over \$400,000 on a lavish retreat for company executives—after they had accepted \$85 billion in Federal bailout money.

The behavior of these financial institutions shows that taxpayers will certainly get a raw deal when the Federal Government does not demand oversight and accountability. These corporations have resorted to taking taxpayer dollars to stave off failures, yet they are still spending like it's business as usual. All the while, the working people of this country are tightening their wallets and coping with a tough economy.

Our country's outstanding public debt is more than \$11 trillion, and it grows by nearly \$4 billion every day. When will the Federal Government stop digging the American taxpayers into this debt?

Mr. Speaker, it's time for our government to start working for the American taxpayer and not the other way around. The American taxpayer is tired and fed up with business as usual. We have got to change the way we do business and remember that the taxpayers pay the bills and the debt of this government.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will say God continue to bless our men and women in uniform, and God continue to bless America.

□ 1930

#### TRIBUTE TO FOUR FALLEN OAKLAND POLICE OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening with a heavy heart on behalf of the residents of my congressional district, the Ninth Congressional District of California, to pay tribute to four fallen heroes from the Bay Area.

This weekend, Sergeant Mark Dunakin, Sergeant Ervin Romans, Sergeant Daniel Sakai and Officer John Hege, all members of the Oakland Police Department, were brutally gunned down while serving in the line of duty.

Oftentimes members of law enforcement go unnoticed. But they provide a critical service to help protect our communities. These men performed their jobs to the fullest every day, knowing that there was a possibility that they would ultimately give their lives in service to their community. Today we honor them and join their families and our community in not only mourning their loss but remembering the sacrifices that they made to protect the people of Oakland, California.

I feel that it is very important that everyone remember that these brave men were not nameless, faceless individuals. They were husbands, they were fathers, they were brothers, they were dear friends to many.

Sergeant Dunakin lived in Tracy, California, and was on the police force for 18 years. He was a graduate of Chabot College in Hayward. He was promoted to sergeant in 1999 and worked homicide cases in the criminal division. Following his transfer to the traffic division, he was active in the Click It or Ticket campaign and took part in multi-agency crackdowns on drunken driving suspects. Captain Ed Tracey described Sergeant Dunakin as “Just a cop's cop. He's OPD to the bone. He is absolutely committed to anything that he leads.” He leaves to mourn his wife, Angela, and his three children.

Sergeant Romans, 43, of Danville, was an Oakland officer since 1996. He was a member of the entry team, and was considered one of the most adept members of the Oakland Police SWAT team by his colleagues. Erv, as he was affectionately known, was promoted to sergeant in 2005 and worked narcotics cases, making a number of high-profile drug busts. He leaves behind three children.

Sergeant Daniel Sakai of Castro Valley was 35 years old. He was considered a rising star on the Oakland Police SWAT team and was recently named a leader of the entry team. Before joining the SWAT team, Sergeant Sakai worked as a K-9 officer responding to calls with his dog, Doc. He loved nature and studied forestry at UC Berkeley, where he also worked as a community service officer escorting students around campus at night. After graduation, he spent a year in Japan teaching English. He leaves his wife, Jennifer, and a young daughter.

Officer John Hege, who was 41 years old, joined the Oakland Police Department 10 years ago after serving as a reserve officer. He graduated from St. Mary's College in Moraga, California, and had taught physical education and oversaw study hall at Tennyson High School in Hayward. He lived with his dog on a small cul-de-sac in Concord, California. While off-duty, he was a high school baseball umpire. Officer Hege also wanted to be a motorcycle cop for many years, and in the last few months he finally got his wish. His colleagues noted that he was always the first to respond on the radio to actually assist other officers or to help on a project.

It is my sincere prayer that, in light of this tragedy, we begin to reexamine how we are addressing the ongoing violence which plagues our country. The events in Oakland this weekend are a prime example of why we must address the gaps that we have in our parole system and also renew our efforts to ban the sale of military style assault weapons in this country. It is hard enough being a police officer without the added pressure of knowing that there could be assault rifles embedded throughout our communities.

We cannot bring back these brave men, but through their deaths we can work and put in place policies that will make our communities safer for the people who live there and also for the police officers who oftentimes have a very dangerous job protecting them. The death of these four officers is really an incomprehensible tragedy that is difficult for all of us to fathom.

I extend my deepest sympathies to the family members of the four officers. This is a very difficult time for members of the Oakland Police Department, the City of Oakland and my entire congressional district, actually, for the entire State of California. My heart goes out to all of those members of the police force who are mourning the loss of their brothers. Our prayers



are with the family and the friends of these brave young men and women during this very solemn time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### TAX THEM TO DEATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the government answer to government-created problems is to tax people and businesses that are producing. The economic philosophy is simple: Punish success by the power of the tax.

The latest government tax plan is the energy tax. The idea is, tax anything that uses energy. And it contains several philosophies. The first one is raise the gasoline tax 10 cents. I guess the government bureaucrats don't think gasoline prices are high enough already. Americans pay 18 cents in Federal gasoline tax, about 20 cents in State tax; and gasoline is approaching \$2 a gallon, so they are going to raise taxes and make it harder for us to drive.

But that is not all. The idea also is to tax mileage of cars. It is called the car user tax. In other words, for every mile an American citizen drives, they are going to get taxed for that mile. Of course, that hurts people in rural areas, it hurts people who don't have mass transit and don't have a choo-choo train to ride to work. But it is the car user tax, and we don't know yet how much that is going to be.

But we have more. The idea also is to tax the use of energy in your home. In other words, when you turn on the lights, you are using electricity and you are going to get taxed for using that energy. If you have hot water in your home and you use a hot water heater that is run by natural gas and you turn on the hot water, since you are using natural gas you are going to get taxed again for the use of energy. And of course in the winter in some places in the United States they use home heating oil to keep warm in the winter. And since they are using energy, they are going to get taxed for that. It is the home use energy tax on all Americans. And of course the same is going to be applied to businesses. But businesses, they are going to pass their taxes on down to the consumer

who has to pay all of those taxes as well.

There is more. There is the cap-and-trade tax, or the cap tax as I call it. What that is, it is based on the unproven mythical theory of global warming and the use of CO<sub>2</sub>; so if you use any CO<sub>2</sub>, you are going to get taxed for that.

There are other taxes. Those include taxes on energy production. What that is, is those businesses—we call them oil companies—that produce energy for the rest of us to use, they are going to be taxed with so many different taxes I don't have time to go through it; but what it amounts to, it will cost the American consumer another 41 cents per gallon of gasoline to pay for that tax on energy production that is being passed from the oil companies down to the American consumer. And, of course, the effect of that, whether intended or unintended, will be to send those energy-producing companies, those oil companies, somewhere else. We already find out that some of them are moving to Switzerland.

When that happens, we will get less tax revenue to begin with. You see, we already have the second highest corporate income tax in the world. And why would we fault oil companies for moving overseas when they are already paying so much taxes? And these energy taxes will increase and encourage people to move offshore and to other places.

Mr. Speaker, whether people know it or not, we do not have alternatives for the use of crude oil or gasoline yet. Some day we might have one of those electric cars that we all get to drive around in, but we don't have it now. So if we keep sending energy companies overseas, make it harder for them to produce, tax the energy consumption, it is going to be more difficult for us to exist in this world.

So why don't we do something a little novel. Why don't we allow more energy exploration, instead of continuing to subsidize the Middle Eastern oil countries who don't like us anyway.

If we explore more, that will create jobs that stay in America. It will bring revenue to the American Treasury, because those oil companies have to pay for those leases. We can then get more tax revenue from those oil companies, and money will stay here, instead of shipping it overseas to foreign countries. A novel idea. And there is not a tax included in any of that.

But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the current bureaucrats never saw a tax they didn't like. So we will all just get to ride bicycles and freeze in the cold dark of winter, and for light we will have to use candles since we can't afford to pay the electricity tax on our homes.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### ENERGY AND ECONOMICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. INGLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, following up on the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) in talking about energy, I have got a different take on that, and the different take is this: It is all about economics.

Actually, technologies exist right now to be the alternatives. The problem is, they don't compete real well against the incumbent technology, because the incumbent technology doesn't have all of its negative externalities attached to it. If you attach those externalities to those incumbent technologies, all of a sudden new things would happen. And rather than being driven by government and grant programs for this or that, it would be driven by free enterprise, with people making money selling the competing technology.

What do you have to do to get there? You have got to figure out a way to, what economists call, internalize the externals. You have got to figure out a way to attach to the incumbent technologies, which in this case with transportation is gasoline, attach the negative externalities to the price. In other words, demand accountability. Insist on accountability. Say we are going to attach the national security risk, for example, to gasoline, and we are going to say, what is it really costing us for a gallon of gasoline? Is it the \$1.90 that I paid recently in my car, or is it a lot more than that? The answer is, it is a lot more than that.

If you consider just the supply chain that we have to protect the assets that we have forward deployed to protect the supply chain, and attribute some percentage, it doesn't have to be 100 percent, but some percentage of the cost, for example, of protecting the shipping lanes that carry this stuff that we are addicted to, to us, if you just attach the cost of a percentage of that, maybe 50 percent of it, give 50 percent cost accounting to somebody else, somebody else's account. But let's account to gasoline at least 50 percent of the cost of the operations in protecting the shipping lines. If you do, it is not \$1.90 a gallon. It is a lot more.

□ 1945

But as long as there is an unrecognized externality, then what happens? There is a market distortion. And as long as that market distortion exists, nothing happens in free enterprise. Because what free enterprise is about is a wonderful thing called "making a profit." And the people generally on this side of the aisle understand very well that we are in business to make money, to make a profit. But when



your competitor gets a freebie in the national security realm or a freebie when it comes to climate change impact, or a freebie when it comes to, say small particulates, when it comes to coal, nuclear doesn't develop, and alternative energies don't develop because you have got this freebie.

Why not continue on with the cheap old technology, the one that really doesn't take a lot of rocket science? You stick pipe in the ground, out comes some crude, you refine it, stick it in a car and you run it. Not real rocket science. But how about some rocket science of hydrogen, for example? Well, you have to internalize some externals in order to make that work for a profit-making venture.

Until then, we will be talking science projects. I'm on the Science Committee. I'm happy to do science projects. But what I really want to have happen is to have people making money selling the competing technology. Here is a way to do it. We are just hearing about how we don't want more taxes. So let's start with a tax reduction. What if you reduce taxes on something, say payroll or income, and then in an equal amount, apply a tax to carbon-based fuels? Then we will see what happens. What would happen then is all kinds of exciting things. The new entrepreneurs in the energy field, the Bill Gates of the world in energy would suddenly do for energy what Bill Gates at Microsoft and Steve Jobs at Apple did for the PC and the Internet. America would break free. It would be no additional intake to the government, and Mr. Speaker, we would be on our way to energy independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SUPPORT H.R. 1245, HOMEBUYER TAX CREDIT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to do something novel tonight. I am going to reach out to my Democrat colleagues. And I'm glad to see some of them, like DON, over there tonight to listen to my exhortations.

Mr. Speaker, the \$8,000 tax credit for first-time homebuyers was one of the reasons why home sales went up by about 5.1 percent last month. That was an indication that we are probably moving in the right direction as far as stimulating some economic growth in the housing industry. But the housing industry is in a depression right now. And we need more than just the \$8,000 tax credit for first-time homebuyers.

Now, back in 1975, Congress passed the Tax Reduction Act of 1975, which

included a tax credit not just for first-time homebuyers, but for all homebuyers, up to \$2,000 in a tax credit. As a result, they increased within the next year by 400,000 the number of houses that were sold, and in 2 years they were back up to the 2 million house level.

So we need to stimulate economic growth in the housing industry across the board, not just for first-time homebuyers. Now KEN CALVERT of California, our colleague, has introduced a bill, H.R. 1245. I'm a cosponsor of it. And it will give a 10 percent credit, 10 percent of the home price, up to \$15,000 for all homebuyers for 1 year. Now if we did that like they did back in 1975—and this was sponsored mainly by Democrats back in 1975—if we did that across the board for homebuyers up to \$15,000, we would stimulate a huge movement towards home purchasing. Twenty-five percent of the people in this country say they want to buy a home within the next 10 years. We can move that up pretty rapidly if we extend the tax credit to \$15,000 and allow everybody to get it for 1 year. And if we did that, I think that would go a long way toward solving the economic problems we are facing right now. Right now, what we are doing is we are throwing money at the problem, and we are hoping that that will solve it. It is probably going to help a little bit in the short run. But in the long run, if we really want to stimulate economic growth and activity, we have to get the free market working again. And the best way to do that in my opinion, and I'm saying this to my Democrat colleagues as well as my Republican colleagues, is to give an incentive for people to buy homes, not just first-time homebuyers, but everyone who would like to buy a home or move into a better one.

So if we allow, say, a 10 percent tax credit up to an amount of \$15,000 for just 1 year, I think you would see a huge movement in the purchase of homes in this country, and it will really help the economy.

Now the realtors of this country and the homebuilders of this country really need help. They want this bill. They think it is extremely important. They are out here this week and they are going to be talking about it. So I would like to say to you, DON, and all my Democrat colleagues and my Republican colleagues, let's get together on this one. We can fight on something else. But right now we have an opportunity to really stimulate home purchases in this country and get this economy moving more rapidly in the right direction.

So I hope you will join with me in cosponsoring KEN's bill, H.R. 1245, and I'll be glad to sign any of you up tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

JORGE LUIS GARCIA PEREZ  
"ANTUNEZ," CUBAN FREEDOM  
FIGHTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. This last Friday, I had the honor of being able to speak by telephone with five brave human rights activists, pro-democracy leaders, inside the totalitarian nightmare that is Castro's Cuba.

One of the great heroes of the pro-democracy movement inside the Cuban totalitarian nightmare is Jorge Luis Garcia Perez Antunez. A black man now in his 40s, Antunez was first imprisoned while he was in high school because of his support for democracy and his opposition to totalitarianism. For 17 years, Antunez was regularly beaten as a political prisoner in Castro's gulag. He never gave in. He was released from the gulag last year, but since he never surrenders, he doesn't stop denouncing the thugs and pirates who have destroyed, impoverished and oppressed the Cuban people for 50 years. Antunez has been routinely detained, dozens of times, thrown into a dungeon and subsequently released, since his release from the gulag.

Some days ago, Antunez began a hunger strike in his city of Placetas, in Sancti Spiritus province, Cuba, calling for the end of the death threats being leveled against Cuban political prisoner Mario Alberto Perez Aguilera; an end to the physical and psychological torture of all Cuban political prisoners; and the cruel and cynical prohibition by the dictatorship against Antunez's sister, Caridad Garcia Perez, being able to rebuild her own house. They don't allow her to rebuild her own house, which was destroyed by one of the devastating hurricanes that passed by Cuba.

Accompanying the hero Antunez when I was able to contact him by telephone on Friday, March 19, was his wife, the pro-democracy leader, Iris Perez Aguilera, whose brother, Mario Alberto Perez Aguilera, is a political prisoner receiving death threats. I'm sure one of many, but the one specified by Antunez, receiving death threats by his jailers. And I also spoke to pro-democracy leaders, Carlos Michael Morales Rodriguez, Alejandro Tur Valladares and Ernesto Mederos. It was my honor to speak with all of them.

Antunez's house was surrounded by state security thugs while we spoke. And he and his colleagues knew very well that our telephone conversation was being monitored by the thug-regime. The courage of these pro-democracy leaders is simply awe-inspiring. They all explained their human rights work and reiterated their commitment to freedom. I told Antunez that I would be speaking in the U.S. Congress this week about him, about his hunger strike, about his heroic struggle for

freedom and the heroic struggle of the other pro-democracy leaders I spoke to, and about all of Cuba's political prisoners.

Fidel Castro and his brother, who now has some titles because of the dictator's intestinal illness, constitute the historical revenge of the brutal, racist European colonialism that the Cubans fought to overthrow for almost a century. But they ultimately prevailed.

Antunez, Biscet and the other pro-democracy leaders who continue to fight the Castros' dyarchy represent today's version of Maceo, Banderas, Moncada and all the freedom fighters who ultimately obtained freedom for Cuba.

Now one of the disgusting realities of today is that the fight of the unarmed Cuban people doesn't exist for the international media and the press, with very dignified exceptions. Why are the Cubans non-persons for so much of the media? Their racial discrimination is as shameful as it is condemnable. But Antunez, Biscet and the other Cuban freedom fighters will prevail. They are the future leaders of free Cuba. Antunez's last words to me on Friday said it all. "Tell your colleagues, the representative of the American people, Antunez ni se rinde, ni se va." "Antunez neither surrenders, nor leaves."

Some are advocating that the new administration agree to the expulsion from Cuba to the U.S. of Biscet, Antunez and other future leaders of Cuba in exchange for some Castro spies currently in U.S. Federal prisons, serving time for conspiring to murder U.S. citizens. That would be a condemnable act that would violate international law as well as the elemental human rights of Cuba's future leaders.

From the floor of the U.S. Congress, I reiterate my admiration for those leaders who confront the totalitarian monster from within Cuba today and who will lead free Cuba tomorrow.

#### AFRICA DESERVES PARITY IN OUR OVERALL FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC, is proud to anchor this hour. Currently the CBC is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California. My name is Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, and I represent the 11th Congressional District of Ohio.

CBC members are advocates for families nationally and internationally. We have played a significant role as local and regional activists. We continue to work diligently to be the conscience of the Congress. But understanding that all politics are local, we provide dedicated and focused service to the citi-

zens and congressional districts we serve. The vision of the founding members of the Congressional Black Caucus, to promote the public welfare through legislation designed to meet the needs of millions of neglected citizens, continues to be a focal point for the legislative work and political activities of the Congressional Black Caucus today.

As Members of Congress, CBC members also promote legislation to aid neglected citizens throughout the world. We understand that the United States, as a bellwether, has the ability to positively impact our neighbors abroad.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to our chairwoman, the Honorable BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. And let me thank the gentlelady for yielding and also for your leadership. Once again, thanks to you, we are here talking about the many, many issues which face our country, but also many of the issues which the Congressional Black Caucus is very involved in leading. And oftentimes the public really isn't aware of these issues and exactly what we are doing. So thank you again, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for your leadership and for staying the course.

As Chair of the CBC, I'm very proud to point out that we are privileged to draw upon the wisdom and expertise of one of our many colleagues on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman DON PAYNE of New Jersey. Congressman PAYNE I must say is more than a member. Of course, he is the Chair of the Africa and Global Health Subcommittee, but he is our resident expert on Africa. And Congressman PAYNE I always say is a Member of Congress who not only understands what our foreign policy should be towards the continent of Africa, but he also understands that Africa deserves parity in our overall foreign policy and oftentimes is in the midst of bringing peaceful solutions to conflicts when others won't go there in many, many dangerous and treacherous situations. He also is on the CBC International Affairs Task Force. And I just want to commend Congressman PAYNE tonight. Thank you for your sacrifices and for your leadership.

We are also represented on the Foreign Affairs Committee by Congressman GREGORY MEEKS of New York, Congresswoman DIANE WATSON of California, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Congressman DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

I would like to briefly talk tonight about Darfur and Sudan. I mentioned Mr. PAYNE earlier, and let me just say that he was the lone voice in the wilderness for many years saying that we should declare that genocide is taking place in Darfur, because that is exactly what did take place.

□ 2000

He finally brought bipartisan consensus to that, the policy of desig-

nating this as genocide, and it took a lot. But the country, our country, has in place, as its foreign policy, that genocide is taking place in Darfur. But it is also important to recognize that we haven't been able to go the next step to really help to end the genocide.

The people of Sudan, they have a desire for a just and lasting peace, but it has been crushed repeatedly by one of the most brutal regimes in the world. More than 2 million South Sudanese have died in the 21-year war and have suffered countless atrocities, mostly committed by the same regime in Khartoum.

Darfurian children, born at the height of the genocide, are now 6 years old, and many of them are still in displaced camps in Darfur or in Eastern Chad as refugees.

Fifteen years ago in Rwanda, the international community turned a blind eye with a million civilians butchered. Have we really done more in the case of Darfur, in South Sudan in Abyei and in Nuba? We declared genocide in 2004, but we haven't acted decisively to stop it. If we had, we could have saved many, many innocent people.

And I have visited Darfur on three occasions, and I have just seen the conditions in the camps deteriorate over the years. And so, now it is very important, given what has just taken place, for the United States to raise its role and elevate our work as it relates to trying to help the world community understand that we have got to do the right thing. We need to support the International Criminal Court in its efforts to hold Sudan President Bashir accountable for his crimes against humanity, and for the President, and we support the President, our President, in appointing a Special Envoy for Sudan. Congressman PAYNE and myself wrote to President Obama, and we are delighted that he has appointed an Ambassador or a Special Envoy to be empowered, and we want him to have the resources to focus on Sudan as a whole with special attention to the ongoing genocide in Darfur. We want full implementation of the CPA and to address the humanitarian crisis because, now as General Bashir has expelled the humanitarian workers, we have an even worse crisis emerging on the humanitarian front.

And so our new Special Envoy is Major General Gratton. He will be the Special Envoy, and he is uniquely qualified. Some of us met him in Darfur, and we know that he is very qualified to undertake these critically important efforts. As the President said, and I quote, he said that "he knows the region, he has broad experience and has my complete confidence."

Let me also say that we have to work very closely with the Special Envoy. And again, we want the Special Envoy to have a team of people with the resources to be able to do this job so he can bring peace to the long-suffering people of the Sudan.

Also, in conclusion, let me just highlight the fact that the CBC has led for many, many years in developing our global HIV/AIDS initiatives and the U.S. response to that.

We were instrumental, last year in taking—and can you believe this, Congresswoman FUDGE, Nelson Mandela and the ANC was on the terrorist watch list until last December. So we were able to get him off of the terrorist watch list before his 90th birthday.

We have established June as Caribbean American Heritage Month, honoring those of Caribbean descent who have contributed immensely to this great country.

We are working now on the Shirley Chisholm Caribbean Education Exchange Program, and trying to make sure that our country, Haiti, the poorest country in this hemisphere, receives the type of attention and resources it deserves to help stabilize the country. Hurricanes, natural disasters, poverty, health care needs are badly needed in Haiti, and the CBC has been working very hard to try to help stabilize that country.

I won't go on and on now, but I just wanted to thank Congresswoman FUDGE because the CBC, again, is continuing to be the conscience of the Congress, not only in our domestic policy, but in our foreign policy, and each and every Member understands that we have to think globally and act locally, and we try to work strategically on both the home front and the international front.

Thank you very much, Congresswoman FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to thank our Chair for her leadership, for her vision, and certainly for her support of this special hour for the CBC.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

From the beginning, our great Nation has been generous, and it has been a safe harbor for immigrants, providing asylum to individuals fleeing political turmoil and humanitarian crisis. But that philosophy has been challenged very seriously, forcing people who have resided lawfully in the United States for over 15 years to return to their country of origin that is no longer their home.

And so today, I rise to urge President Obama to reverse former President Bush's executive order forcing Liberian refugees back to their country. I ask the President to extend lawful status to these persons who have been law-abiding and tax paying citizens for years. These are people who have built lives in this country, who have children who are U.S. citizens, and who do not want to tear their families apart.

Families like Janvier Richard, who lives in my congressional district in Maryland. She fled Liberia for America in 1991 after she and her family were

threatened during the Liberian civil war. Janvier has spent 18 years in America, a generation, a lifetime in America. And yet, today, Janvier Richards, and her family, after they were granted Temporary Protected Status by the United States because of the political turmoil and atrocities being committed in Liberia, have now built a home here in these United States for 18 years.

But in 2007, President Bush effectively ended Temporary Protected Status for Liberians by signing a memorandum authorizing Deferred Enforced Departure.

What does that mean?

That means that President Bush ordered all Liberians who had been granted TPS, temporary protected status, to leave the United States by March 31, 2009.

Now, to be sure, Liberians have made tremendous progress, back on the road to democracy under the able leadership of President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf. But today, the question before us and the justice challenge is really about those who came to this country, like Janvier, from Liberia, started families and businesses, worked hard, paid taxes. Their children are now United States citizens and grew up in America.

Janvier Richards wrote me a letter saying: "I am being told to return home to a country that has no place for me. I have a 5-year-old son born at Holy Cross Hospital in Silver Spring, Maryland, and should be starting school this fall as a new kindergarten student. I have been working and paying taxes since I was 16, and I am happy contribute to American society by all means. This has been my home for 18 years," Janvier writes.

Richard has followed the proper procedures to become a U.S. citizen. She fled here to the United States with her father, who was a U.S. citizen, who filed for citizenship on her behalf. But since he passed away in 2002, immigration officials have continuously ignored Janvier Richard's inquiry about the status of her application, and now she faces deportation.

This is not about people wanting to take advantage of the United States or use Social Services. Janvier has been working and paying taxes since she was 18 years old and has never received government assistance.

This Congress and this administration must work to allow Liberians like Richards and her family to remain lawfully in this country as contributors, as taxpayers, and as citizens. We need to support these families that have become integral parts of our communities.

In closing her letter, Janvier Richards writes, and I quote, "Immigrants started this country. Immigrants are needed in this country. It shouldn't take up to 10 to 15 years before someone can get their green card or citizenship papers. We are working," she continues to write, "we are helping the country succeed. We are needed."

Ms. Richards and her son, the 5-year-old born at Holy Cross Hospital in Silver Spring, others like her who have come to this country and started new productive lives, have done nothing to deserve deportation. And they came here under the spirit in which we have granted asylum status to millions around the world for the generations of this country.

And I, therefore, ask President Obama to stand with Janvier Richards and other Liberians like her and reverse the current executive order.

I thank you, gentlelady, and I yield back.

Ms. FUDGE. I want to thank my colleague for her very moving remarks and because she is here and even though she doesn't feel well, because it is such a very important issue. So I want to thank her.

Mr. Speaker, I would now yield to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Well, thank you so much, Congresswoman FUDGE, for sponsoring this hour. I think it is extremely important to educate our constituencies to a greater extent than we are somehow able to do in 1 minute or even in the heat of a debate.

Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted again to join these distinguished colleagues, the Chair of this special hour, Congresswoman FUDGE, as well as our Dean, I guess, of foreign affairs in the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman PAYNE. And certainly, I would like to associate myself with the comments of our dear Representative from Maryland. I would like to associate myself with her remarks because I also want to talk about Liberia, but I want to talk about it from the perspective of protecting the investments that we have made in Liberia.

Liberia's relationship to the United States is certainly longstanding. Liberia was settled in the early 1800s by freeborn Blacks and former slaves from the United States of America. These settlers used the Constitution of the United States as the model for their new government. They designed a flag with red and white stripes with a single white star. And, of course, in 1824, the settlement was named Monrovia, after the American President James Monroe, and Monrovia remains the capital of the modern-day Liberia.

I can tell you that, unfortunately, because of arbitrary rule, economic collapse, corrupt governments, Liberia fell into two devastating civil wars in the span of a little more than a decade, as well as a legacy of a ruthless and reckless leader in Charles Taylor, who nearly destroyed the country, created regional instability, drawing in Sierra Leone, another country, and really creating an insecure situation. The most egregious of those things, in my mind, Congresswoman FUDGE, was the engagement of child warriors, children warriors in this fight.

During that fighting, Liberians suffered immensely. Over a quarter of a

million lives were lost, and more than half of all of Liberia's 3.5 million people were driven from their homes, including those who found safe haven in our country to escape the violence.

I have visited Liberia a couple of times and heard some of the stories of people, women who were crossing the roads, pregnant and found themselves killed on the road right there for their food. I saw, looked into the vacant eyes of some of the child combatants that they are trying to rehabilitate in the country.

And so I was really pleased when late, late last week, our President, Barack Obama, given all of the challenges that he has, stopped to allow Liberians, who took refuge in our country from the civil war in their home nation to receive deferred enforced departure protection for 12 more months. The President's recent order is so important because Liberians who have been granted either this temporary protected status, TPS, or deferred enforcement departure, DED, are allowed to remain in the U.S. rather than be forced to return to a country in the midst of war.

And let us not think for one moment, Congresswoman FUDGE, that this country is not still at war. And they are still at war because, despite the sage leadership of Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, she is taking tremendous steps to overcome the ravages of war. She is basically having to start from scratch from the destruction that was caused by these two wars. She is been busy trying to rebuild the nation's education and health care system, oversee the deactivation and reintegration of the old security forces and ex-combatants. I mean, they need a new police service. Who do you trust and who don't you trust?

□ 2015

And this is a very excruciating process which the United States, of course, thank God, is helping them to do.

They have got to decommission these ex-combatants and help restore its shattered economy in the midst of the worst global recession in decades. Because of the extensive damage done by Charles Taylor and the conflict, things that we take for granted, such as roads, police to protect residents, courts to convict criminals, a basic economy, and confidence people have in its government have all got to be rebuilt. This is not a time to send President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf another whole slew of people to provide educational opportunities for jobs. It is shocking to go to Liberia. It is the poorest day I have ever had in my life, Congresswoman FUDGE. I have never lived in a community that did not have a library, and I went to Liberia, a place where they do not even have a library in major parts of Liberia.

The challenges are many. Again, they lack health care, education; they suffer from an unemployment rate of 80 percent—yes, eight-zero—80 percent,

lingering cultural and social effects from the legacy of war, and again, the haunting eyes of those child soldiers who have got to be reintegrated into society after experiencing or committing serious crimes. Seventy-six percent of Liberians in 2006 lived on less than \$1 per day. Fifty-two percent live on less than 50 cents per day. One hundred fifty-seven infants per 1,000 die before their first birthdays. Over 1,000 mothers die per 100,000 live births.

Most Liberians do not have access to safe drinking water. I was there in Liberia, and I had a bottle of water. Kids came up to me, fighting over the bottle of water, and I was very reluctant to give these children a bottle of water that I had drank from. Someone said to me, "Ma'am, that is the cleanest water that they will ever have, perhaps, in their entire lives that is in that bottle." These are the conditions that they are living under. Electricity is sporadically available. The list goes on and on and on, and this is only an hour that we have here, Madam Chair.

One tool that the President does have, though, is the economic support flowing into her country from Liberians here in our country, some because of the special protections granted to them by TPS and DED. With the Liberian economy struggling and a global economic recession not making things any easier, money being sent to a country from relatives living in the U.S. is a veritable lifeline.

According to the Liberian government, remittances from the U.S. totaled \$60 million in 2007, providing essential support. According to the International Monetary Fund, Liberia's two civil wars have reduced Liberia's real gross domestic product to about 40 percent of its prewar level between 1989 and 2003. There is no magic wand available to President Johnson-Sirleaf to restore 60 percent of GDP overnight. Again, it would be extremely egregious for us to return citizens to that country without the prerequisite infrastructure. She has also, I hope, the steadfast support of this Congress and of this administration to Liberia and its people.

A couple of years ago, she was right here in this Chamber, and addressed a joint session of Congress, an honor thrust upon this inspiring leader because of the historic connection and special relationship between our two countries. In that address, she said, "The Liberian people are counting on me and my administration to create the conditions that will guarantee the realization of their dreams. We must not betray their trust. All the children I meet, when I ask what they want most, say, 'I want to learn.' 'I want to go to school.' 'I want an education.' We must not betray their trust."

The transition from conflict to peace is never quick nor easy. Madam Chair, I am afraid for the future of Liberia if we do not provide them with adequate support. I am going to amend my remarks and submit them for the RECORD.

In closing, I just want to commend President Obama for his welcomed step. He shares the strong belief that there is a beautiful democracy budding in Liberia, and I congratulate President Obama for his strong expression of support for our Liberia. The good thing about it is that this Nation is just rich with natural resources and that we now have a leader with credibility in President Johnson-Sirleaf. She is so decent as well as being brilliant. This can help create tremendous wealth for its people. It now has this capable leader for its vision, and the diamonds and minerals and its port can all lead to great prosperity, and we should be proud to be their great friend.

With that, I yield back my time to you. Thank you again for your stewardship over this hour.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to thank my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Wisconsin, for her passion and for her insight.

At this time, I would now like to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey who, indeed, is the dean of the CBC as it relates to matters of Foreign Affairs, especially those in Africa.

Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much, Representative FUDGE. Let me commend you for taking the leadership for this hour on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus. We certainly have appreciated your experience as a former mayor and as a person involved in politics in the State of Ohio and how you have come in, not as a trainee, but fully running. We know of the untimely death of your predecessor, Representative Stephanie Tubbs Jones, but we certainly appreciate your taking up the mantle and moving forward.

I would just like to speak briefly on several of the countries that we have mentioned.

We have just heard the gentlelady from Wisconsin talk about Haiti, and I might just mention briefly that Haiti has had a long and difficult history, highlighted by prolonged poverty, political instability and underdevelopment, resulting in a politically fragile state with the lowest standards of living in the entire western hemisphere. With the assistance of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti and large amounts of international aid, Haiti has been attempting to establish a foundation for longer economic development. Security issues have presented the primary risk to stability while restoring economic growth, investment, employment, and access to basic services have been the major and equally formidable challenges to sustainable development.

President Preval, since assuming his second nonconsecutive term in office in May of 2006, has emphasized the importance of rebuilding democracy, rebuilding Democratic institutions and of establishing conditions for private investment, which is key to the development of any country to create jobs.

The success of his government will depend largely on its ability to improve security and social economics.

The condition in the country: 76 percent of the population lives on less than \$2 a day. These are conditions that make it very difficult. Security conditions have improved, but Haitians have seen their already substandard living conditions deteriorate further with the rise in global food prices and in the recent devastation by a series of hurricanes.

When people say, "Why Haiti? Why should we be concerned?" number 1, they are very close to our shores. Number 2, there has been a history of United States' involvement in Haiti. As a matter of fact, in the Battle of Savannah, when we fought for independence of the United States of America from Britain, Haiti sent soldiers over to fight in the Battle of Savannah. As a matter of fact, recently—and I visited last year—the statue that has been dedicated to Haitian soldiers who fought for the independence of the United States' 13 original colonies away from Great Britain.

Also, as we know, Haiti became the first revolt of enslaved people to defeat the colonists, and that sent a message throughout Central and South America. As you know, Haiti in 1804 defeated the forces of the great Napoleon's army, and as a result of this 12-year war between France and Haiti, France was defeated. There is great wealth that France would get from Haiti, which actually was more than all the 13 colonies of the United States provided for Britain. The one portion of the island of Española, of which Haiti is half of it and the other half is the Dominican Republic, gave more wealth to France. So, when France lost Haiti, it lost economics, and as a result, the Louisiana Purchase came about.

As you may know, at that time, the United States was landlocked. The United States only went to the Mississippi River, and it was the land that was owned by France. Because France after the long war with Haiti needed cash—it was land rich and cash poor—it sold the Louisiana Territory for, I think, about \$15 million and, therefore, opened up the West. The Lewis and Clark expedition started in St. Louis as a result of the purchase of the Louisiana Territory. So Haiti has had a tremendous impact on the United States of America.

Finally, about Haiti, part of the erosion which we see was spurred along in World War II. With the U.S. being cut off from the Pacific region, there was a need for rubber to be grown and produced. There was a Haitian grower who said that it was going to be impossible for rubber trees to grow in Haiti. However, the Haitian leadership wanted to help in the war effort and wanted to placate President Roosevelt, and so they cut down natural kinds of ecology, and tried to introduce rubber trees, which would not grow, which was already known by Haitian farmers, but

they did it anyway. As a result, erosion started. This was one of the areas that, with the natural habitat taken down and the foreign intervention of other plants, Haiti's erosion also began.

So I just would like to say that we need to take a look at the status of Haitians in America. We need to change that situation so that people who have come to this country will definitely have an opportunity to become full-fledged citizens of our country.

Let me just quickly talk about the Liberians who we have heard about, another country. We just heard our previous speaker talk about the fact that there was Deferred Enforcement Departure status which expired on March 31 of 2009 for Liberians as a result of the war with Charles Taylor. People got TPS, Temporary Protective Status, from Liberia. Then when that ran out, they had the Deferred Enforcement Departure, and we have gotten word that we believe that Liberians will be able to have a 1-year extension of the DED, from words that I received from President Obama's office.

Let me just say that, once again, in 1820, \$100,000 was funded by the U.S. Congress that went to help start Liberia. As you know, Monrovia was named after President Monroe, and many free black men and women went to Haiti. As a matter of fact, there was an integrated group of blacks and whites that went back originally, but the whites all died, and were unable to survive. Only the blacks survived.

□ 2030

And so we have had a long relationship with Haiti and with Liberia, and we should, certainly, with the 3,600 people who are in the DED current status, I hope that within the next year—and there will be a rally on Wednesday at 1:30 here at the west terrace at the Capitol that will allow Liberian leaders to come and show their appreciation for the extension, and we urge anyone who is free on Wednesday of this week at 1:30 to come and participate in the rally.

Finally, we've heard about Darfur. I was pleased that we were able to get the genocide resolution through, but I did expect more to happen from the world, and I have been disappointed.

I went to eastern Chad, and I spoke to an elderly woman who talked about what happened in her town: a pregnant woman was bayoneted there, a neighbor was shot. Even in huts they would lock, tie the door together and burn the huts and the boys would be burned to death, all of this by al-Bashir, the president who has been indicted by the International Criminal Court and should stand for trial.

As has been mentioned, there's been a long, north-south battle between the NIF government, the National Islamic Front, and the SPLA, the Sudanese Freedom—South Sudanese Liberation Movement, the late Dr. Garang, for 21 years. Four million people have been

displaced, two million people have died.

And 21 days after Dr. Garang was able to get the comprehensive peace accord signed, his plane mysteriously crashed and Dr. Garang was killed.

I immediately went there and participated in the mourning and attended the funeral of him. His wife and children—Rebecca, his wife, is very strong and continues to move forward on the question of South Sudan, the comprehensive peace agreement must be upheld and Darfur, the International Criminal Court, should go forward with the prosecution of al-Bashir. He has put out 13 nongovernmental organizations who are feeding people and are bringing in food and so forth. This must not stand, and he must be stopped.

We could talk about the Congo, but I will yield back the balance of the time so our chairperson of tonight's special order may be able to conclude in any manner that she sees fit. But let me once again thank you for taking this hour, and we still have much to do. The CBC, the conscience of the Congress, will continue to move forward, not only domestically, but internationally.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would very much again like to thank our teacher, our dean, our resident expert for his remarks this evening.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is a leader in advocating for human rights and humanitarian assistance. These ideals are embodied in the desire to assist and guide others that have lost hope.

At the United Nations World Summit in 2005, 191 members of the UN expressed support for the idea of a responsibility to protect. This responsibility to protect proclaims that mass atrocities that occur in one country are the concern of all countries. This echoes the great Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, declaration that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

With Dr. King's words in our hearts, I rise today to speak about the grave tragedies affecting individuals in Darfur and the temporary protective status, better known as TPS, for individuals from Liberia and Haiti.

I begin with the humanitarian emergency that is taking place in Darfur.

The history of the information in the Darfur region of Sudan is long and complicated. Sudan has been embroiled in a civil war for decades. The conflict took a turn for the worst in 2003 when the Sudanese government mobilized militias known as Janjaweds to attack opposition groups. The militia has brutalized the people of Darfur with murder, rape, torture, and pillage. They have burned down entire villages forcing people to flee their homes and their livelihoods. Entire portions of the region are now ruled by roving bands of armed gunmen.

Since 2003, 300,000 Darfuris have died as a result of a conflict, and approximately 2.7 million have been forced from their homes.

The conflict in Darfur is also having a devastating effect on its western neighbor, Chad. Nearly 200,000 refugees from Sudan have joined the 90,000 persons displaced by the civil war in Chad. To further complicate matters, both Chad and Sudan have accused each other of supporting rebellions in their countries. Last week, however, the situation in Darfur took a grave turn for the worse.

Sudan's President, Omar al-Bashir, expelled 13 nongovernmental organizations, or NGOs, and 6,500 aid workers from the country. This was in direct retaliation for Bashir's indictment on war crimes and crimes against humanity by the International Criminal Court, better known as the ICC, on March 4, 2009. Bashir's unsubstantiated accusation that the NGOs were cooperating with the ICC investigation only heightens the urgency and necessity for an international response.

The civilian population is composed of two million people who are spread out among 200 refugee camps in Darfur, and in 12 refugee camps in eastern Chad. The UN estimates that 40 percent of Darfuris depend on outside assistance for their survival. This expulsion of humanitarian groups, such as Oxfam and Doctors Without Borders, will adversely affect millions of civilians who rely on NGOs for their most basic food and medical needs. Who will continue to provide these urgent services, Mr. Speaker?

The Sudanese government has clearly demonstrated that it is unwilling or unable to assist its citizens throughout this very conflict. The expulsion of the NGOs is only the most recent act that endangers millions of lives. This is why the international community must unite and forcefully declare that Sudan's government not hold its citizens hostage.

Last week, I and nearly 80 Members of this Congress sent letters to the Secretary General of the League of Arab States, the chairman of the African Union and the President of China urging them to insist that the government of Sudan allow humanitarian organizations to re-enter the country.

President Bashir must separate the ICC action from the charity relief efforts of relief groups. The expulsion violates international humanitarian law and damages efforts to resolve the conflict. Without the NGOs, more than one million Darfuris will be left vulnerable to disease and starvation. These are civilians, Mr. Speaker. They are caught in the cross hairs of a conflict they did not begin and they have no power to end.

By sacrificing his people for political gain, President Bashir has shown a call as disregard for human life that the international community cannot ignore. President Bashir must reverse the expulsion order and allow NGOs

back into Sudan. The people of Darfur have suffered enough. To compound their anguish at this critical time is unconscionable.

I applaud President Obama's appointment of a special envoy to Sudan. President Obama named retired Air Force General Scott Graton last week as a special envoy to Sudan, choosing a close adviser with broad experience in the region. The President has indicated that the conflict in Darfur is a priority for his administration. The CBC is encouraged by the administration's stance, and we look forward to working with the President and the Special Envoy Graton.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague from the State of Texas, the gentlewoman from the State of Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Ohio, first of all, for her leadership in helping to share with our colleagues hour after hour enormously important issues facing not only the United States but facing the world. And I join her this evening.

And I was very appreciative of joining with my chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, who I just saw at another meeting who was able to be here, Congressman BARBARA LEE. I want to thank her for her leadership. The chairperson of my Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health, Chairman DONALD PAYNE, who speaks volumes about Africa, and as well, chairs the Foreign Affairs Task Force, of which I am a member of the Congressional Black Caucus; and one of our great leaders as well, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE. I know there were probably others that were here, and I did not get a chance to see them on the floor. But I do want to acknowledge that this is an important hour for us. And I am pleased to be able to join my colleague.

Let me just suggest that there are many ways that we can look at Liberia, Haiti, and Sudan. And it is my intent because I think we have talents here in the United States, Representatives of African nations, that, frankly, we don't get a chance to interact with as much as we would like. And I am going to accept the challenge given to me to host a meeting of African ambassadors that our colleagues will have a chance to sit down with and hear their story, their insight certainly on the issues that we're now raising, particularly Liberia and Sudan—obviously Haiti is in the Caribbean, and I will speak to that issue.

But let me tell you why I want to offer that suggestion. And the reason is because I sat down with one of our distinguished ambassadors last week who mentioned that with all of the meetings on the economy, the worldwide crisis in the economy, interestingly enough, the Continent of Africa is not on the agenda.

We heard an eloquent speech by Prime Minister Brown, and all of us

were moved by his passion and his values, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. And I am told that he is as eloquent and as energized before his own Parliament and in international meetings as he was with us in the joint session.

And we are very blessed, if you will, by having an administration that has the cultural nexus and the heart and the intellect to be concerned about these issues. President Obama has been received overwhelmingly, his election, on the continent. I think we are poised to be of a gigantic opportunity to do what Prime Minister Brown has charged us to do: Don't forget the impoverished. Don't forget the journey we were on trying to address the question of poverty. And that was a big issue as it relates to Africa.

Now, of course, the economy has come and there may be donor nations who have made pledges who have not completed their pledges, but Africa still has the same concerns and therefore, it will be very important to hear from these ambassadors on the issues that we're talking about, which I expect to talk about here tonight.

For example, our esteemed president of Liberia who came out of the World Bank and who has a great respect of not only women of this country, but certainly of our administration and our past administration. She came to Liberia after Charles Taylor in a country that was void of infrastructure, void of water, void of—when I say “water resources,” infrastructure that would have clean running water; void of infrastructure that would have utilities or any mode of, if you will, phone, utility service; void of operating school systems. So we know that she has made great strides, and I have details here.

But at the same time, we are well aware that she needs more resources. We have to have this on the agenda. We have to be able to partnership with the African Union, for example, strengthen it as the African Union attempts to develop its own mission and mandate on how it addresses the issue of conflict.

So I think if I said anything about Liberia, there are certainly two major points: one, the Liberian Americans, but Liberia and the new president, Mrs. Johnson, is someone who has the, if you will, the monetary knowledge because of her experience here in the United States and her training in some of the financial structures of our country, but, also, the will to do it.

□ 2045

We must not forget Liberia in its journey toward economic independence, but it is a microcosm of the needs of the continent.

I also want to thank the administration, President Obama, for heeding the cry of many Members who wrote a letter about Liberian Americans. I'm told by our chairperson, Chairperson PAYNE, Liberian Americans will be here in the Congress or on the West steps to highlight their plight of continued TPS status, deferred, if you



will, deportation that has been going on and on and on.

We have got to solve that. That is something we can look to as we reform immigration. Many times when we discuss immigration, people start thinking it's not their problem, it's a global problem, it's a problem that faces many different ethnic groups. And we all need to come together as a family and fix it so people can be here legally; they can pay taxes; they can, in essence, be separated from those who want to do them harm.

So I want to put Liberia in the eye of the storm as it relates to the economy, and the challenge that the ambassador gave me was why don't you consult with us who are here and let us tell you the economic impact on the continent, what we need to be involved.

The second is, of course, Sudan and I might have been one of the last CODELs, congressional delegations, of three that were able to actually get into Darfur, into the camps. And I had spent time in Chad as well some years back before I was able to get into Darfur. I've been denied—it's a very long story of how long it took, and I frankly didn't know whether I'd get in the time that I went since we were among those who got arrested in front of the Sudanese embassy.

But we went into those camps, and the key thing that I want to say to the distinguished gentlelady is how valuable the NGOs were. They were literally the lifeline of the camps. They were a lifeline of the children. They were the lifeline of the women. And the women were the anchor of the camps because any man that would venture out to try to be a supportive family member, to provide income, would be killed by the janjaweed, or whatever the conflicts, they were targets. And so, mostly, it would be the women. Tragically, the women would be raped, and so things are not well.

And the complete disregard that the leadership of Sudan, the President of Sudan, has for the indictment, for the world family, there is no respect there. And we have a challenge, and we have got to be able to match the will of this country and our foreign policy, our belief in democracy, our belief in the security of children and family and the ability to live on your land without threat and danger and murder and pillage, we've got to the match that with the will of the countries on the continent, the African countries, the heads of States.

This is a new day now. This is in essence an America that has a commonality, that people are not only interested and are sacrificing on behalf of Sudan and the crisis there, but likewise, we have an administration that accounts Susan Rice, who is the U.N. envoy who I worked with on the crisis between Ethiopia and Eritrea. She is a committed and knowledgeable person about the world but particularly about Africa, and I count on her wisdom. I count on the wisdom of the Secretary

of State, Hillary Rodham Clinton, and I count on that foreign policy team, along with the envoy that our President has just selected, Major Scott Graton, that adds to the team that can now focus on Sudan but also focus on the continent of Africa.

I join in denouncing the treatment of our, if you will, NGOs. Just about a year or so ago, we lost a valiant State Department employee that was killed in Sudan, and I frankly have never gotten over it, and I offer my deepest respect and sympathy to his family. It was a horrific act.

And so it is important that we put our foot down on the atrocities that has occurred in Sudan, and people should understand, people are in Darfur because they have been moved off of their land. You can't help to rebuild this area, irrigate it, give people—these are farming people. Don't tell them, well, just go to the city and get another life, get a life. These people have lived on their land, and they have bothered no one. They've raised their families, and now they're being literally torn apart.

Southern Sudan, that tried to get on its feet, that has a lot of oil, it's still in conflict between the Khartoum government and Sudan. Southern Sudan, who has all the oil and cannot seem to get an agreement, to my current knowledge—and I may have need of some additional update to my current knowledge—has not been able to solve the distribution of the oil moneys, and so they're suffering. This is an immediate crisis that needs to be fixed.

As it relates to Haiti, let me again mention the work of the Congressional Black Caucus. We have been working on Haiti for, I don't know, as long as I've been here, but we have had wonderful conversations with President Preval who is a committed and dedicated leader, who is looking for funding for infrastructure, funding, if you will, to rebuild after the terrible onslaught of hurricanes that they had in the last year, 2008. He is looking to work with us and the Congressional Black Caucus in the appropriations process, and we're looking to work with him.

Haiti is a wonderful ally of the United States. We can never pay them for the blood that they shed standing alongside us in the Revolutionary War, and their victory was our victory. Our victory was their victory, and they're hardworking people. You can see that here in the United States, and you can see that obviously in Haiti.

And so what I think, as I close, that you selected hot spots that symbolize the need for us to be engaged, and as I said, finally with respect to immigration, Haiti, too, so many distraught cases of Haitians treated unfairly in the United States because they don't have the parity that happens when Cubans are fleeing persecution as is defined. Haitians have been fleeing persecution, economic persecution, political persecution, who are here and cannot return back. I want them to get parity,

and any immigration bill that I have any hands on, it will be part of that bill.

And so I think it is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, that we look at these issues and be assured that we work on behalf of all of these people. It is our commitment to make their lives better by our statements here today on the floor, but also our collaboration to continue to work on the issues that impact people's lives and as well the quality of life. We need to save lives and we certainly need to save them.

I just want to put on the record that I am working with a Haitian teacher who has suffered so much. She teaches math. She's well-respected. She had a court order that said she was not going to be deported. It's a long story, but I simply want to let the Haitians in Houston know we have not forgotten her, and we want her to stay united with her family.

Thank you very much for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Sudan, Liberia and Haiti. These are three of the most troubled nations in the world, desperately in need of support from other nations, including the United States.

#### SUDAN AND DARFUR

I am pleased that President Obama has appointed a Special Envoy to Sudan. Major General Scott Graton is both a humanitarian and a professional soldier. He has proudly served our country but more importantly brings to this position the experience and gravitas necessary to lead our mission.

The United States has for most of our history been a leader among nations in attempting to help foment democracy and bring peace to warring parties in regions throughout the world.

Sudan's western region of Darfur has been embroiled in violent conflict since 2003, which has brought a weighty death toll and displaced over 2 million people. Just recently, Darfur rebels killed 200 people near the capitol city of Khartoum. With violence continuing to worsen in the region, I call on the international community to renew its commitment to finding a solution to the conflict in Darfur.

In 2007, I had the chance to lead a Congressional Delegation to the region of Darfur to see the first hand devastation that has swept through the region.

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am very concerned about the displaced children who suffer due to the lack of nutrition and access to clean water. Additionally, child mortality remains a significant problem throughout the region. I am also concerned that the global food crisis could exacerbate the conflict, placing more children at risk.

We, as a Global community, must unite to address this issue. Let us not let race, religious ties, or bureaucratic systems hinder us from fight for the people of Darfur. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I will continue to work towards a solution for the ongoing conflict in Darfur. We must remain steadfast to gaining peace in the region.

Darfur has been embroiled in a deadly conflict for over four years. During that time, at least 400,000 people have been killed; more than 2 million innocent civilians have been

forced to flee their homes and now live in displaced-persons camps in Sudan or in refugee camps in neighboring Chad.

And more than 3.5 million men, women, and children are completely reliant on international aid for survival. Not since the Rwandan genocide of 1994 has the world seen such a calculated campaign of displacement, starvation, rape, and mass slaughter.

Since early 2003, Sudanese armed forces and Sudanese government-backed militia known as "Janjaweed" have been fighting two rebel groups in Darfur, the Sudanese Liberation Army/Movement (SLA/SLM) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM).

The stated political aim of the rebels has been to compel the government of Sudan to address underdevelopment and the political marginalization of the region. In response, the Sudanese government's regular armed forces and the Janjaweed—largely composed of fighters of Arab nomadic background—have targeted civilian populations and ethnic groups from which the rebels primarily draw their support—the Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa.

The Bush Administration recognized these atrocities—carried out against civilians primarily by the government of Sudan and its allied Janjaweed militias—as genocide. António Guterres, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, has described the situation in Sudan and Chad as "the largest and most complex humanitarian problem on the globe."

The Sudanese government and the Janjaweed militias are responsible for the burning and destruction of hundreds of rural villages, the killing of tens of thousands of people and rape and assault of thousands of women and girls.

With much international pressure, the Darfur Peace Agreement was brokered in May 2006 between the government of Sudan and one faction of Darfur rebels. However, deadlines have been ignored and the violence has escalated, with in-fighting among the various rebel groups and factions dramatically increasing and adding a new layer of complexity to the conflict.

This violence has made it dangerous, if not impossible, for most of the millions of displaced persons to return to their homes. Humanitarian aid agencies face growing obstacles to bringing widespread relief. In August 2006, the UN's top humanitarian official Jan Egeland stated that the situation in Darfur is "going from real bad to catastrophic." Indeed, the violence in Darfur rages on with government-backed militias still attacking civilian populations with impunity.

On July 30, 2004, the UN Security Council adopted resolution 1556 demanding that the government of Sudan disarm the Janjaweed. This same demand is also an important part of the Darfur Peace Agreement signed in May of 2006.

On August 31, 2006, the Security Council took the further step of authorizing a strong UN peacekeeping force for Darfur by passing resolution 1706. Despite these actions, the Janjaweed are still active and free to commit the same genocidal crimes against civilians in Darfur with the aid of the Sudanese government.

International experts agree that the United Nations Security Council must deploy a peacekeeping force with a mandate to protect civilians immediately. Until it arrives, the

under-funded and overwhelmed African Union monitoring mission must be bolstered. And governments and international institutions must provide and ensure access to sufficient humanitarian aid for those in need.

The Darfur Accountability and Divestment Act of 2006, H.R. 180, sponsored by my colleague BARBARA LEE would require: The Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) Division of Corporate Finance and the U.S. Treasury to require all companies listing securities on United States capital markets, either directly or through a parent or subsidiary company, including partly-owned subsidiaries, having business operations in a country with a genocide declared by the Department of State or Congress, to disclose the nature of their business operations.

The United States Government (federal) to prohibit contracts with multi-national business enterprises if: They maintain business relationships and investments with national, regional and local governments involved in genocide; and they participate in business activities with any warring parties or rebel groups perpetrating genocide. States and Cities that have divested or are in the process of divesting State and City funds from companies that conduct business in Sudan; and United States colleges and universities that have divested their funds from, or placed restrictions on investments of their funds in, companies that conduct business in Sudan.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) to investigate the existence and extent of all Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board investments with national, regional and local governments involved in genocide; or business activities with any warring parties perpetrating genocide; or related to debt-obligations issued by the government of Sudan.

Also, the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission is charged with maintaining and publishing a list of the names of the business enterprises identified by the Securities and Exchange Commission as having ties with perpetrators of genocide.

It also reasserts Section 11 of the Darfur Peace and Accountability Act (stripped from the Senate version) that nothing in that act or any other provision of law shall be construed to preempt any State law that prohibits investment of State funds, including State pension funds, in or relating to the Republic of the Sudan.

#### LIBERIA

Mr. Speaker, A part of the world that has been neglected for many years is West Africa. And one of the gems of this region is Liberia. I am pleased that Liberia's temporary protective order was extended.

Temporary Protected Status (TPS) is the statutory embodiment of safe haven for those aliens who may not meet the legal definition of refugee but are nonetheless fleeing—or reluctant to return to—potentially dangerous situations.

There are numerous regions throughout the world where discrete and insular minorities might need this type of relief. TPS is blanket relief that may be granted under the following conditions: there is ongoing armed conflict posing serious threat to personal safety; a foreign state requests TPS because it temporarily cannot handle the return of nationals due to environmental disaster or there are extraordinary and temporary conditions in a foreign state that prevent aliens from returning, pro-

vided that granting TPS is consistent with U.S. national interests.

The Secretary of Homeland Security in consultation with the Secretary of State, can issue TPS for periods of 6 to 18 months and can extend these periods if conditions do not change in the designated country. To obtain TPS, eligible aliens report to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), pay a processing fee, and receive registration documents and a work authorization. The major requirements for aliens seeking TPS are proof of eligibility. The regulation specifies grounds of inadmissibility that cannot be waived, including those relating to criminal convictions and the persecution of others.

The United States currently provides TPS or deferred enforced departure (DED) to over 300,000 foreign nationals from a total of seven countries: Burundi, El Salvador, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Somalia, and Sudan. Liberians have had relief from removal for the longest period, first receiving TPS in March 1991 following the outbreak of civil war. Liberians currently have DED until March 31, 2009, and has now been extended by the Obama Administration.

Liberia is Africa's oldest republic, but it became better known in the 1990s for its long-running, ruinous civil war and its role in a rebellion in neighboring Sierra Leone. By the late 1980s, arbitrary rule and economic collapse culminated in civil war when Charles Taylor's National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) rebels overran much of the countryside, entering the capital in 1990 and killing then President Samuel Doe. In 1995, a peace agreement was signed, leading to the election of Mr. Taylor as president. Another war began in 1999, escalated in 2000, and ended in 2003.

It pitted the forces of Charles Taylor, elected president in 1997 after Liberia's first civil war (1989–1997), against two armed anti-Taylor rebel groups. It also destabilized neighboring states, which accepted Liberian refugees and, in some cases, hosted anti-Taylor forces and became targets of the Taylor regime.

In 2003, Mr. Taylor—under international pressure to quit and hemmed in by rebels—stepped down and went into exile in Nigeria.

A transitional government headed by Chairman Gyude Bryant steered the country towards elections in 2005. Around 250,000 people were killed in Liberia's civil war, and many thousands more fled the fighting. The conflict left the country in economic ruin and overrun with illegal weapons. 15,000 U.N. peacekeepers were deployed to help in stabilizing the country.

Liberia held elections in October 2005, with a presidential runoff in November, a key step in a peace-building process following its second civil war in a decade. Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, an economist, won the presidential runoff vote, with 59.4 percent of votes cast and took office in mid-January 2006, becoming the first female president of an African country.

Most observers viewed the vote as orderly, free and fair. It fulfilled a key goal of an August 2003 peace accord that had ended the second civil war and led to an ongoing, U.S.-aided post-war transition process, which is bolstered by the multifaceted peacekeeping and development-focused U.N. Mission in Liberia (UNMIL).

Liberia's security situation is stable but subject to periodic volatility. Liberia's economy and state structures remain devastated by war. Humanitarian conditions are improving.

Liberia receives extensive U.S. post-war reconstruction and security sector reform assistance. In March 2006, former President Taylor was arrested in Nigeria and transferred to the U.S.-supported Special Court for Sierra Leone (SCSL) to face war crimes charges. He was later transferred to The Hague, the Netherlands, where he is on trial by the SCSL.

In addition to providing substantial support for Liberia's post-war peace and reconstruction processes, Congress has maintained a continuing interest in the status of Charles Taylor and in ensuring funding for the SCSL. Other legislation proposed in the 109th and noth Congresses centered on immigration, debt, and tax haven issues, and the commendation of Liberia for successfully holding elections.

The United States has voiced continuing support for President Sirleaf's government since she took office. In February 2008, former President Bush and Mrs. Bush traveled to Liberia, among other African countries. The general aim of the trip was to discuss continued U.S. partnerships with African countries in the areas of democratic reform, respect for human rights, free trade, open investment regimes, and economic opportunity.

In Liberia, President Bush's trip focused on U.S. help in strengthening Liberia's post-war democratic institutions, Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GEMAP) efforts to improve management of public finances and combat corruption.

It also highlighted Liberia's status as a target country of the President's Expanded Education Initiative, which through a program component called the Ambassador's Girls' Scholarship program had as of early 2008 supported 2,700 scholarships for girls in Liberia, and its status as new President's Malaria Initiative recipient country. It also drew attention to U.S. security sector reform efforts in Liberia.

Former First Lady Laura Bush and Former Secretary of State Rice, among other prominent U.S. guests, attended President Sirleaf's inauguration in 2006. Their presence, Sirleaf noted in her inaugural speech, "manifests a renewal and strengthening of the long-standing historic special relations which bind our two countries and peoples." She also stated that it "reflects a new partnership with the United States based on shared values" and that Liberians are "confident that we can continue to count on the assistance of the United States [...] in the urgent task of rebuilding of our nation."

President Bush awarded the U.S. Presidential Medal of Freedom to Sirleaf in November 2007. President Sirleaf has made several official visits to the United States, including in February 2007, when she attended a World Bank-organized Liberia Partners' Forum donor meeting in Washington, DC. She made another such visit in March 2006, during which she addressed a joint session of Congress on March 15 and met with President Bush on March 21.

She reportedly closely consulted with U.S. officials regarding her priorities for Liberia and the status of Charles Taylor. During a pre-inaugural December 2005 trip to the United States, Sirleaf also met with key U.S. and international financial institution officials.

Liberia-related activities by the 110th Congress built on those pursued by the 109th Congress. Congress continued to monitor the activities of the SCSL and, in particular, the Taylor war crimes case, and provide funding for the SCSL. Congress's focus on Liberia also centered on aiding Liberia's efforts to consolidate its post-war governance and economic rebuilding processes. Issues that drew particular congressional attention included:

Efforts to rehabilitate schools, clinics, roads and other public facilities; Progress under the GEMAP transparency initiative; Progress of U.S.-backed security sector restructuring, and possible expansions of related assistance, e.g., for the creation of a quick reaction gendarme unit; increased mobility capacity building for the police and military; and maritime waters and land border monitoring and interdiction capacity building.

Consideration of potential continued support for UNMIL and the pace of its projected drawdown; and U.S. decision-making on debt relief for Liberia and the status of future Brooke Amendment restrictions on Liberia. The U.N. voted to lift a ban on diamond exports, which fueled the civil war, in April 2007. A ban on timber exports was lifted in 2006.

Liberia's security situation is stable but subject to periodic volatility. Progress in governance under the interim government that preceded that of President Sirleaf was mixed; widespread corruption within it was widely reported. Liberia's economy and state structures remain devastated by war.

Humanitarian conditions are improving. Liberia receives extensive U.S. post-war reconstruction and security sector reform assistance and in addition to providing substantial support for Liberia's post-war peace and reconstruction processes, Congress has maintained a continuing interest in the status of Charles Taylor and in ensuring funding for the SCSL.

I hope that President Obama makes his way to Africa very soon. And his presence in a country like Liberia would be a bold statement that change is on the way.

HAITI

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in solidarity with my colleagues on the Congressional Black Caucus, to speak against the United States' unfair treatment of the people of Haiti.

Haitians should also receive a Temporary Protective Order. Haiti is one of the most impoverished countries in the western hemisphere and the fourth poorest country in the world. There are 8.3 million people residing in Haiti.

The people of Haiti are also facing a severe medical crisis as a result of their poverty. Haiti is the home of 90% of all HIV/AIDS patients in the Caribbean. Over 200,000 Haitian children will be orphaned by HIV/AIDS. Child mortality rates in Haiti are also excessively high. For every 1,000 births in Haiti, 74 infant deaths will occur.

The social conditions in Haiti are as deplorable as the medical condition. Of the millions of Haitian residents, only 46% have access to clean drinking water. Furthermore, 53% of all Haitian residents are malnourished.

Despite our close proximity to Haiti, and the widespread publication of the social and medical plight of Haitian residents, the U.S. government has insisted on blocking humanitarian aid. The U.S. government is attempting to shape the political landscape in Haiti to the severe detriment of the innocent people of Haiti.

The United States government owes Haiti substantial funds in foreign aid. Substantial loans have been negotiated for the people of Haiti. Some estimates have the loans valued at as much as \$146 million dollars. The United States government is delaying the disbursement of these funds to advance their political aims. While the U.S. government stubbornly maintains these restrictive policies the people of Haiti are suffering and dying.

The U.S. government has promised Iraq \$80 billion in aid to rebuild their war torn country. The people of Haiti have suffered as well. But instead of providing much needed aid, the U.S. government blocks humanitarian efforts and refuses to honor outstanding loans.

Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace that our Congress stands by while the people of Haiti suffer and die. I join my colleagues on the Congressional Black Caucus in imploring the U.S. government to let Haiti live.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague because she always does bring great focus and great insight, and I thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with a few comments.

Mr. Speaker, the suffering of the people of Haiti and Liberia are pressing issues. The United States has more options available in dealing with Haitians and Liberians. It is time for the United States to exert that control and extending temporary protected status, or TPS, for individuals from Haiti and stand by our TPS for Liberians.

As a signatory to the United Nations protocol relating to the status of refugees, the United States has agreed that it will not return an individual to a country where his life or freedom would be threatened. U.S. immigration law employs TPS designations to address this very issue. TPS protects individuals from being deported to a country where that person would be threatened on the basis of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular group, or political opinion.

TPS is also sought by those aiming to flee extreme poverty, depravation, violence, and the dislocation brought on by famines or natural disasters in their home countries.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is time for this country to understand the significance of helping those who cannot help themselves.

I began this hour talk about a quote from Dr. Martin Luther King, and I will close with the same one, that injustice anywhere is injustice everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask that this Congress and the Members who are hearing this or who will read this at some other point do make themselves aware of the plight of the people who we spoke about today.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on March 4th, the International Criminal Court (ICC) issued an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

That very same day, following the ICC's decision, the Government of Sudan expelled 13 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) from

Darfur, accusing them of cooperating with the ICC investigation. These non-governmental organizations include many of the most respected humanitarian organizations in the world. Among them are Oxfam, Doctors Without Borders, International Rescue Committee, and Mercy Corps.

The withdrawal of these organizations will leave millions of civilians without access to food, clean water, and medical assistance. This outrageous action is just another example of the cruelty of the Government of Sudan towards its own people. And it proves that the ICC's decision to issue an arrest warrant for Bashir was entirely justified.

The Government of Sudan has been carrying out a campaign of genocide against the people of Darfur since 2003. The Sudanese government is supporting militia groups that are engaged in genocidal practices in communities of African farmers in the Western province of Darfur. These militias are razing villages, systematically raping women and girls, specifically targeting and destroying food and water supplies, and massacring communities. In the last five years the conflict has taken the lives of hundreds of thousands of civilians. On October 1, 2008, the United Nations reported that there were almost 2.7 million internally displaced persons in Darfur, almost 300,000 of whom were newly displaced in 2008, and an additional 2 million people continue to be directly affected by the conflict.

In July of 2007, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1769, which authorized the deployment of a joint United Nations/African Union peacekeeping force in Darfur, known as UNAMID. The force was to consist of a total of 26,000 troops. However, UNAMID was deployed at only 63 percent of its full strength as of December 31, 2008, and does not have the capacity to fulfill its mandate to protect civilians in Darfur. UNAMID must immediately deploy its forces at their full strength, and take all necessary and appropriate action to protect the people of Darfur.

Early in 2006, I visited the Darfur region with my good friend from California, Speaker NANCY PELOSI, and I was deeply disturbed by what I saw. As far as the eyes could see, there were crowds of displaced people who had been driven from their homes, living literally on the ground with nothing but little tarps to cover them. That was three years ago, and yet this genocide has been allowed to continue.

If we are serious about opposing genocide, we must take decisive action to stop it.

We must demand that all nations respect and enforce the decision of the ICC.

We must demand that humanitarian organizations be allowed to return to Sudan.

We must enact and enforce comprehensive sanctions against Sudan without exceptions.

We must demand that China stop bankrolling the genocide.

And we must demand that the United Nations immediately deploy its peacekeeping forces and do everything necessary to protect civilians and save the people of Darfur.

It's long past time to get serious about genocide.

#### ECONOMIC SITUATION FACING OUR COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House for an hour. We're going to be talking about the economic situation facing our country and specifically the budget situation.

Just about a month ago, the President right here on this floor laid out some of the proposals for what his budget would represent, and then the next day he laid out the blueprint for that budget. And I think it caught a lot of people around the country by surprise, really caused some great concern by people, especially as it relates to this record level of funding, taxing, and borrowing.

And over the last few weeks, you've heard a lot of people laying out those details, just what that spending means, just what those taxes mean in terms of the average cost to American families. The middle class families, not just rich people as was purported, but middle class families will be paying over \$3,000 on an energy bill.

And then what I think really frightened the American people was the record level of borrowing that this budget represents, and with over \$1.7 trillion in the first year in next year's budget that the President has submitted, over a tripling of the deficit that was, quote, unquote, inherited.

And so, as these record levels of spending and taxes and record levels of borrowing have been laid out, you've heard a chorus of echoes, not just by those of us here in this Chamber who are strongly opposed to that irresponsible spending, to that unprecedented level of taxing that will literally stifle the growth of small businesses and middle class families, but also the borrowing that affects our next generation. This isn't money that we have. This is money that would be borrowed from our children and our grandchildren, saddling them with, on estimates, of over \$3,000 of debt just in the President's spending bill, that \$800 billion piece of legislation called stimulus, that just in its first few weeks added more than \$3,000 of national debt on to the backs of every man, woman and child in this country.

And so with that, I wanted to lay out some of the details of just what the spending means, just what these record deficits mean to the American people, to a budget process, and historically, to lay out where these deficits that the President's budget really stand in relation to history in time because these are things that have not passed yet.

And the American people all across the country, they've had these tea parties that have been sprouting up in States all throughout the Nation and literally hundreds, in some cases thousands, of people are showing up and saying enough is enough, Mr. President and Members of Congress, stop this reckless spending, stop and back away

from these tax increase proposals that will stifle middle-class families and our small businesses and don't go and borrow trillions—not hundreds of billions—but trillions of dollars from our families, from our children and our grandchildren who we want to leave a better life to. We don't want to saddle them with trillions of dollars in new debt.

And some of these charts that we're going to show and talk about really illustrate what this means, what these budgets mean because these budget documents that are being debated up here in Congress, they talk about big numbers and they talk about programs. And some of these are government programs that are good, successful programs. Some of these are government programs that should have never been in place in the first place. Some of them are programs that are failing, yet will be getting more money from the Federal Government.

And where is this money coming from? And as people look and ask these tough questions, what they realize is this is money we don't have. This is money that would be borrowed in record numbers, and this chart right here shows real well, leading into this administration taking office just 2 months ago, the fact that the deficit at the end of the current fiscal year will be more than tripled by the President's proposed budget.

This budget in 2010 is the President's proposed budget, over \$1.7 trillion, and in fact, on Friday, the Congressional Budget Office came out with revised numbers. And unfortunately, those revised numbers were not good for the President. They surely were not good for the taxpayers of this country. They were not good for our children and grandchildren.

My daughter, Madison, who's 2 years old, will be inheriting more of this debt, thousands of dollars in national debt. Now this deficit that was projected to be \$1.7 trillion has risen to \$1.9 trillion just in the last few days.

□ 2100

There's no end in sight. What we're saying is: Mr. President, don't go down this road. There is a better way. We need to rein in the spending that is going on here in Washington. We need to look out across the country and see what other people that are dealing with these tough economic times are doing.

Families are cutting back, Mr. Speaker. Families are cutting back to deal with these tough economic times. They're making adjustments in their household budget. They're stretching their dollars. Some people are saving and paying down debt. And at time that we're seeing families making responsible decisions and States dealing with their deficits—and yes, States are hurting too—but States are making cuts to be responsible.

It seems like here in Washington is the only place where spending is out of

control and people just think there's no end. But there is an end. As people ponder these record deficits that are shown on these charts, one of the things we're going to try to do here in this House, at least, is to let the people's voices be heard and say: Enough is enough.

We've got to stop this out-of-control spending. It hasn't happened yet. These bills have not even been filed yet. Just the outlines. This \$1.7 trillion number for next year's deficit hasn't even gone through a committee process yet.

So there's still time to stop this. There's still time to stop this out of control spending. That's what we're going to be talking about tonight.

We're going to show some more charts and we're going to talk some more about the historical and future numbers. First, I'd like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a friend of mine who has been talking about this same issue for weeks and months as well, my friend, Mr. JORDAN.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank my friend and colleague from Louisiana. I appreciate his good work on this issue and many others. My friend mentioned the tea parties that are taking place across this country. The reason you see families and taxpayers and Americans gathering at these events is because they get it. I learned a long time ago that the people always get it before the politicians do. And they understand that this kind of spending and what it means for their kids and their grandkids and what it means for future generations of Americans is just plain wrong.

My colleague has pointed out some of the numbers. But just put it in perspective of just what has happened in the last 6 weeks. First, we had the \$700 billion so-called stimulus and all the program spending that was in that bill. The bill was designed to help jumpstart our economy, but we all know it was mostly just spending on Federal Government programs.

Then we had the \$410 billion omnibus with its over 800 earmarks. Now, this week, with the budget vote going to happen in the Budget Committee, which I have the privilege of being a member of, we will now have, as my colleague pointed out, a budget that has the 10 largest annual deficits in American history. A budget that will go from—and this is important—from 29 percent of GDP spending to over 28 percent of the gross domestic product. A budget that will increase spending over \$1 trillion this year; a budget that will double the national debt in the next 8 years.

Frankly, and I think this is interesting, a budget that adds more to the debt in 6 years—now, think about this—this administration is going to add more to the national debt with their budget numbers in the next 6 years than it took all 43 previous Presidents to accumulate. So more than 6 years that it took over 200 years to get to. That's how much spending we are talking about.

You don't take my word for it. Take the statement that Senator GREGG made today, where he said this budget is going to, in his words, "bankrupt the country." This is the same guy that the Obama administration wanted as a part of their administration. Initially offered him the job of Commerce Secretary.

Take some senior Democrat Members of the Senate. Senator CONRAD said, "More discipline on the spending side is also going to be required of this budget." Some Democrats are getting the idea this budget is way out of line. They understand what my colleague talked about, and that is this budget is harmful to future generations of Americans, harmful to our economy, and is the wrong direction to go.

We need a budget that spends less, taxes less, and borrows less. That is what we want to talk about this evening.

I'm happy to yield back to my colleague, and look forward to participating more in this hour. But I appreciate his leadership on this issue and reserving this time this evening.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, I want to thank my friend from Ohio for pointing that out. One of the things you talked about is where all of this spending has gone just in the last few months. We've heard a lot of talk over the past few months—the last 2 months, really, that President Obama has been in office—about all of the problems that have been inherited; that were laid on his doorstep when he became President.

We've got to be very careful at paying attention to the facts and looking at in fact how we did get here today, now that we are in March. This isn't something that started before January 20 when the President took the oath of office.

We've got a chart right here that actually shows some of the spending that my friend from Ohio was talking about. When we go into this stimulus bill, as it was called, a stimulus bill that spent \$787 billion in today's dollars, the Congressional Budget Office expects that with interest and debt service it will end up costing over \$1.2 trillion in deficit spending—money we did not have.

This bill was a bill that President Obama himself filed—not a bill, in our opinion, that will help get the economy back on track. It was a bill that did some spending on some infrastructure issues. Less than 10 percent of that bill in fact was spending on infrastructure.

The vast majority of that bill was spending on government—growing the size of government, both Federal Government and State governments, and actually adding employees not to the private sector, which is what many of us want to see. When we talk about stimulus, we think about how we help those small businesses get that loan to go out and use their entrepreneurial spirit to create jobs in the private sector, to put people to work, to give people the opportunity for a lifelong ca-

reer, not creating more jobs in government, growing the size of a government that's already too big.

In fact, that's what that stimulus bill did. It added over \$1 trillion. And you see a spike in spending there. And then immediately right after that, less than a week, a bill that got little notice because it happened right after the President's spending bill, which he dubbed the stimulus bill, was this omnibus spending bill—over \$400 billion, a bill that grew the size of government by 8 percent in 1 week. In 1 week.

Over \$400 billion coming on the heels in February of that stimulus bill. And you see the spike that it created in spending. None of this was spending that the President inherited. This was all spending that he created on his own. In fact, we just found out—we're going to continue for months, unfortunately, finding out some of the things that were in that bill because that so-called stimulus bill was over 1,000 pages long. Again, over \$1 trillion in actual spending.

That bill was filed on a Thursday night. That final bill that was voted on in the House on a Friday, it was filed at 11 p.m. on a Thursday night. Nobody on the Democratic side, even those who were actually on the conference committee, had the opportunity to read it.

And now we are starting to find out some of the things that were in that bill—not things that help stimulate our economy to get our economy back on track. In fact, just last week we found out as the country was outraged, rightfully so, finding out that executives from AIG were receiving bonuses—over \$160 million in bonuses—from Federal money that they got from that financial bailout, which many of us here opposed.

But we found out that they got that money under the authority of language that was put in the President's stimulus bill. That's right. The stimulus bill that this President signed in February actually contained language that was inserted by dark of night. No one wants to take credit for it. But we know now Senator CHRIS DODD, the Democrat chairman of the Banking Committee, was instructed by White House officials to put language in the President's stimulus bill protecting the ability of AIG to give out bonuses. That was in that stimulus bill.

Who knows what else is in there because we continue to find out more of the damaging repercussions from that bill. Yet, that bill gave us over \$800 billion of immediate increased national debt. Over \$3,000 for every man, woman, and child came from that stimulus bill in new deficit spending.

Again, another chart that displays just how high these record deficits are, because when you start talking about numbers and billions of dollars become hundreds of billions and then it becomes trillions of dollars, as we're talking now, sometimes it's hard for people to grasp numbers when you get into that range because it's just numbers that this country has never seen

before. These are unprecedented amounts of spending.

Yet, when you talk about a \$400 billion deficit, which occurred in 2004 and, as can you see, there was a trend downward. Those deficits were actually decreasing under President Bush. Still, spending that many here are not comfortable with and would not have liked to see continue.

I am a cosponsor of a bill to balance the Federal budget. We should have a balanced budget in Washington. Unfortunately, we don't. But at least there was a trend downward to reduce the size of those deficits. Then, here comes the President's budget. Files it. Over \$1.7 trillion in deficit spending. You see this massive spike. Largest deficit in the history of our country. That comes off the back of the President making the quote, "We cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences."

President Obama said that right here on this House floor on February 23. "We cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences." Then, the next day he filed a bill, his budget outline, that actually adds a \$1.7 trillion addition to our national debt in 1 year.

So, ultimately what people are more concerned about is the actual deeds. Not as much the words, but the actions. The actions are scaring a lot of people in terms of these record levels of spending.

With that, we've got a friend of ours from Louisiana, a new Member, somebody who has been passionate in this cause of controlling deficit spending, getting a hold of runaway spending in Washington, Dr. Fleming.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, I thank the gentleman, my fellow Louisianan, Mr. SCALISE, for yielding for a moment. I also thank my friend from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) for his comments as well.

You know, we are talking a lot about budget deficits. And we hear this word to the point where we're almost numb. We have to ask ourselves: Well, what difference does it make? If we go another year in deficit spending or perhaps over \$1 trillion in deficit spending, is it going to change our lives?

So I think the average person out there who's maybe watching us on C-SPAN this evening has got to contemplate: What difference does that make?

Well, let me point out a couple of things in history that maybe we should think about. You may recall that during World War I, the allies defeated Germany and, after doing so, we required war reparations. The only way that Germany could deal with that, could actually make those war reparation payments, was just to print more money. They had to deficit spend big time.

It became such a problem that it literally took a wheel barrow to carry enough currency to go buy a loaf of bread. Of course, that sounds silly. It sounds like a caricature. But these people were in desperate need.

We, of course, suffered during the Great Depression. But the Germans,

because of this, were in a tremendous need. It caused a complete collapse of their culture and their society. And what did we get in return? We got Nazism. We got Adolph Hitler. He took control of Germany only because that country became so desperate that it could not keep what was otherwise a democracy, could not keep that going.

We fast forward to the 1960s when we went through this second wave, if you will, of social programs in America; the first being, of course, the New Deal under FDR and so forth.

We have Lyndon Johnson who, of course, instituted many entitlement programs, many of which we have today. We saw that that deficit spending began at that point, and it began to accelerate. It was worsened by a prolonged war in Vietnam. But we really didn't see evidence of it, just like today.

Well, are we really seeing evidence of budget deficits? Are we really impacted in our daily lives?

Well, slowly but surely as the seventies rolled around and we began to also have problems with energy, we began to see inflation going up to the tune of 10, 12, 13 percent. We also went into a period of stagflation, where the economy became stagnant, prices remained high. The people who were hurt the most in all that were people on fixed incomes, because every year their dollars bought less.

□ 2115

And so then this country got into something we call cost of living increases, and everybody looked forward to that. They had to have the cost of living increases. But some got more than others and some didn't get any at all, and so we saw the deterioration in our economy and our standard of living as a result of inflation. To solve this, we put the hammer down by cutting off the supply of money, which made interest rates go up. I can remember trying to buy a house and getting a mortgage for an 18 percent interest rate, and that is because we were trying to bring the growth of money under control.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of deficit spending and budgets that are out of control do affect us in everyday life. I am old enough to have seen this happen, have studied it in school, have family members who were injured during World War II indirectly as a result of some of these financial consequences that occurred.

I feel like one of the main problems we have with our government today is we don't learn from history. History just seems to repeat itself over and over and over again. If there is anything we have learned in the past, that is that we have got to have fiscal discipline in our government. At home, I have to balance my budget, as difficult that is sometimes. My city, my State, they all have to balance the budget. Why is it that my Federal Government, the most important government, the most powerful government in this

world, why is it that it can't keep its fiscal house in order?

I am a newbie Congressman, I have only been here 2 or 3 months. Before I came here, I really have had this nagging question: What is it about Washington that Washington can't get it right? And I was hoping that in coming here I would get at least some insight as to why we do crazy things with our spending and so forth. Unfortunately, now that I am here, it is worse than I ever thought. I am still seeking those answers.

Mr. SCALISE. If I can reclaim my time. I sure don't want to discourage you. There is a Chinese proverb: May you live in interesting times. And we are definitely living in interesting times.

I think the good news is, this is the best time for people with the focus that you have got, as a new member, somebody coming here to try to rein in out-of-control spending, this is the exact time to be here because this is the time where speaking up can stop this train, this train of runaway spending, as this bill that has been proposed has not passed into law yet.

The public is starting to have the same level of discomfort that those of us here tonight have, and I think the opportunity for us to galvanize that energy that is going on all around the country as we talk about these tea parties that people are having spontaneously to protest about this record level of spending and borrowing and taxing. We have got the ability to stop this from happening, because some of this has happened, as we have pointed out, but the worst has not yet happened. But if nothing changes, then it will happen. And that is where we have an opportunity. And I know my friend from Ohio has something to add, and then we have other people to join us.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I appreciate the gentleman.

Not only is it record levels of spending; it is being done at a record pace. Let me just give you a couple facts. Think about this. This is why Americans, as we have talked about already, are showing up, Mr. Speaker, at these tea parties, because they are sick of this type of activity from their government that their tax dollars support.

Think about this: \$24 billion is being spent each day. Over the first 50 days of the new administration, Democrats have spent approximately \$24 billion a day, most of it with borrowed money. Over the first 50 days of this new administration, Democrats have spent approximately \$1 billion an hour, most of it with borrowed money.

So it is not just the amount; it is the pace at which this spending is going on. And you wonder why thousands of people are showing up in cities across this country, families, taxpayers, small business owners are showing up and saying, enough is enough. We are tired of this bailout fever, this spending fever that has got a hold of Washington. We want some sanity back in



our government. We want some sanity back in our Congress.

And it's not just about the numbers. We are going to give tons of numbers here in this hour, and the gentleman from Louisiana and the doctor from Louisiana have given some numbers and some history as well. But in the end, it is about people and the impact this has. Think about this budget that is going to be in the Budget Committee for a vote this Wednesday, 2 days from now, this budget with record levels of spending, record deficit, tenth largest annual deficit in American history over the next 10 years, think about this budget. And I don't think it is being an alarmist to say this: This is an attack on freedom, because think about what this budget does. It is the largest tax increase in history. When you take money out of the pockets of families, and I have said before, I am convinced some politicians won't be happy until they have an IV hooked up to the taxpayers' wallet and they can hit the drip button any time they want. They want the money. They think they are smarter than the American family out there.

So record level of taxes, unprecedented continuation of the spending that we have been talking about, a further nationalization of health care. Now, think about all three of those for a second. When they take your money, you have less freedom. When they spend and spend and spend and mortgage our kids' and grandkids' future, that simply means the next generations of Americans are going to have less freedom because they are going to have to pay that money back, which means less money in their pockets to go after their goals and dreams. When you have a further nationalization of health care and you have some centralized board here in Washington deciding what kind of health care you and your family are going to get, that is a loss of liberty. And the worse one, which we haven't even got to, and I know my colleague from Louisiana understands this issue probably better than anybody on the floor tonight, that is this cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax concept, which will be the largest tax increase in history. Every single family, every single business owner is going to pay more in energy and utility costs. All those in this budget.

So I think when we talk about an attack on liberty and an attack on freedom, it is not using too strong of language, I think it is just being honest. Because the word and principle we most associate with the United States of America is freedom, and that is what this budget is attacking. And that is why we are here tonight under the leadership of our friend from Louisiana talking about how bad this is and the direction that it takes our country, and why we think our policies of keeping taxes low, getting spending under control, not imposing this crazy cap-and-trade concept on American families and business owners is the right approach to take.

With that, I yield back to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, I thank the gentleman from Ohio. And what you talked about, we definitely are going to cover in detail later on throughout this hour tonight on both the historical side, as my friend from North Louisiana talked about even going back to World War II and some of the flaws of the spending that was encountered during the New Deal leading up to World War II, but also on today's proposal, that proposal that you will be looking at in the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things we want to point out on this tax proposal, because when the President talked throughout the campaign, when he talked here on the House floor just a few weeks ago, one of the things he said was 95 percent of the American people will not see their taxes raised by a dime. And while he may have been technically accurate in that statement, what many people are finding out now by the cap-and-trade, what many of us call an energy tax or a cap-and-tax proposal, those American families that are making in the bottom 95 percent, so to speak, in this country, they won't be seeing a dime increase, they will be seeing over \$3,000 a year in tax increases in the form of higher energy bills, and that is this proposal that is in the President's budget, \$1.4 trillion in new taxes.

Some of this falls on the people making over \$250,000. Here, we are playing class warfare, something that I don't agree with because it is not good policy. But this right here, the small business and investor's tax, generates \$630 billion. This is what the President talks about when he says for those people who are in the top 5 percent of income earners, people making over \$250,000, will see a tax increase. What he is talking about is a \$636 billion tax increase, half of which will fall on the backs of small business owners in this country. The people that actually employ more than 70 percent of the American workforce will be seeing a tax increase.

Now, anybody that can explain how that is good fiscal policy, especially during tough economic times, the floor is open for them to discuss it, because no one has yet to come and explain that. This is a horrible proposal. But on top of that, what they have also proposed is this cap-and-trade tax, and it is \$640 billion. That hasn't been talked about much by the President in terms of its impact, but what this tax means, in fact the budget director for the President just 1 year ago when he was working for the Congressional Budget Office said that this would mean over \$1,600 a year in new taxes that people would pay on their electricity bills.

So I guess what he means when you are not going to pay another dime, \$1,300 to \$1,600 a year in new energy taxes is not a dime, but it something that would break many families in this country. But it would fall on the backs

of every family in this country. No family under the current proposal is exempted. So a married couple making \$30,000 a year with two kids will be paying about \$1,300 a year more in energy costs from the President's own budget.

This is bad policy. This is policy that we are going to fight. We are going to fight it in committee. It hopefully will not get to this House floor, but we will fight it on this floor. And one of the people that will be fighting that battle with us is our good friend from Georgia (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank my good friend from Louisiana for yielding.

This is a steamroller of socialism that is being shoved down the throats of the American public, that is going to strangle the American economy and is going to choke the American people economically. NANCY PELOSI, HARRY REID, and Barack Obama are driving this steamroller of socialism. Socialism never has worked, it never will work. It is not going to work today, and it hasn't worked in the past, as our doctor colleague from Louisiana was just talking about the history, and I agree with that.

The thing that this is going to hurt most, though, are people on limited income. We hear from our friends on the Democratic side that they are for the poor people and for the disadvantaged, but this cap-and-tax policy, or cap-and-trade as it is called, is going to hurt the most the people on limited income, the retirees. It is going to hurt people who are at the bottom end of the social ladder; because, as you said, Mr. SCALISE, it is going to be \$3,000 per family that they are going to have to pay, not only for energy costs, but when gas and diesel prices go up, that means it costs more to get food to the grocery store. That means that grocery prices are going to go up. It means that it costs more money to get medicines in to the drug stores, so medication is going to go up. Every single good and service in this Nation will go up because of this cap-and-tax policy that is being proposed by this administration and by the liberals on the Democratic side. It is going to strangle our economy, as I just mentioned, and it is going to hurt the people who can least afford to pay the \$3,000.

I am a physician, as the gentleman knows. Many of my patients can't afford to pay an extra \$3,000 out of their pocket to pay for this crazy idea of taxing energy at this kind of rate. It is just untenable, it is totally unacceptable, and we have got to stop it. And that is what Republicans are doing here tonight, is talking about this, and we are going to continue to fight to stop this.

In fact, the reason I came down here tonight to join you in this discussion, if you would just take the top chart down and we will look at the top chart as well as the one just below it that you just covered up.

We keep hearing from our Democratic colleagues that all this financial problem is something that they inherited and they are trying to fix it. Well, they didn't inherit it; they have created it themselves. And the chart that you have up top just shows that the budget deficit is going to climb markedly under the proposals that have already been passed by this House. We have just seen bill after bill after bill that has increased the deficit.

We are borrowing too much money from our grandchildren. I don't know a grandparent in this country that will say anything but, I will try to sacrifice for my children and for my grandchildren. That's what parents and grandparents do, we sacrifice for our children and our grandchildren. But the Democrats don't want to do that. They want to take from our children, they want to take from our grandchildren.

Republicans have presented many, many alternatives to the housing bill that this Congress passed that is going to increase the cost of housing loans to everybody, and it is going to actually deny people, particularly just getting in the market that don't have good credit ratings, it is going to deny the poor people from being able to get mortgages in the future.

We saw this awful TARP bill that President Bush and Hank Paulson pushed forward, we have seen how that has been mismanaged. That is borrowing from our grandchildren. We have seen bill after bill, and now this budget on top of that, we are borrowing too much, we are spending too much, we are taxing too much, and it has got to stop.

□ 2130

Republicans have offered many alternatives. But the Democratic leadership are being obstructionist. They won't even hear of our plan, because they are driving this steamroller of socialism down the throats of the American people. I'm beginning to think that there is a very concerted effort to try to change the philosophy of government in America, one, as Mr. JORDAN was just talking about, where we are going to lose our freedom. We have seen that happen historically. We have got to put a stop to it. It is up to the American people. It is up to the American people to put a stop to it by demanding that we not pass this budget that the Democrats in this administration are bringing forward.

We have got to stop bailing out AIG and all these other entities that are just taking us down the road to financial serfdom of the American people. We have got to stop it. It is up to the American people, and it is up to Republicans to stop it. We have got to get the American people to demand that our voice as Republicans is heard so that we can present our alternatives that NANCY PELOSI won't even bring to the floor. She won't allow our proposals to be heard in committee. We can't get a vote.

It is wrong. It is hurting the American people, and it is hurting the people who the Democrats say that they want to represent, and that is the poor people and the disadvantaged people, the people on limited incomes. So we have proposals, Republicans have proposals that will stop the spending, that will stop the taxation, that will look to the free enterprise system, that will get our economy back on the right road so that we can solve this financial crisis that we have and even get the housing market back on the right road. But our proposals need to be heard on this floor.

So the American people need to demand that our proposals are heard, voted upon and let's have a debate. We would want to join with our Democratic colleagues to find some commonsense, market-based solutions that will maintain freedom and stop this steamroller of socialism that is going to take away from not only this current generation, but it is going to put our children and our grandchildren in a position that their standard of living is going to be much lower than ours is today.

It is up to us. And we are going to continue to fight. That is what we are doing here tonight. I congratulate you, Mr. SCALISE, for being down here tonight with these charts to try to show the American people the direction we are headed by this administration, by the leadership in this House and this U.S. Senate. We have got to stop it. We have got to put the brakes on this steamroller of socialism so that the American people can be free and can throw off the shackles of the Federal Government, can run their family, run their businesses and run their lives without all the government intrusion. And that is what we are here fighting for tonight.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. Thank you. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate what the gentleman from Georgia talked about, because that is, in fact, the reason that we are here tonight. It is not that we are willing to throw in the towel, take this and just accept this train to run down the track. What we are trying to do is talk about this problem and not just lay out the proposals that are here before us, but the implications of those proposals, to families all across this country. In fact, these proposals fly in the face of the decisions that families across this country are making themselves. As they deal with tough economic times, people are actually acting in a responsible way. They are cutting back their spending. They are setting money aside and paying down debt. But they are sure not going deeper into debt. If you have got a high credit card balance, the last thing you do is go order two more credit cards and then run up the balance on those.

That is what the President's proposal in his budget does. It, in fact, triples the current year level of deficit spend-

ing. I want to make this point again as we talk about the history revisionism that is going on as people talk about what they inherited. There was a deficit that President Obama inherited. The problem is that he is tripling that deficit in his first budget out the box. He is tripling that level of spending in a way that is irresponsible. He even acknowledges, as he is doing it, that deficit spending is irresponsible. And anybody is free to go back in time and criticize people in the past who helped create this national debt that we have. I have surely done it. Many others have done it. But when you criticize something, you don't replace the thing that you're criticizing by doing it two or three times even worse.

So, if he is going to stand with us and criticize the deficit spending, then he needs to actually stand with us and start cutting this Federal budget, not tripling, tripling the size of this debt, the national deficit that we are going to be facing next year. And so that is what we are talking about tonight is what we are going to be fighting in the coming months.

One of the people at the forefront of that fight is my friend on the Budget Committee, Mr. JORDAN from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I just want to make a quick point and just reiterate what my friend from Louisiana just had mentioned. Think of the contrast of what American families are having to do with their budget in this tough economic situation they find themselves in versus what the Federal Government is going to do. I just want to go back and talk about one fact I had talked about earlier, because when you talk about spending at this rate, the new administration, the Democrats in Congress, are spending approximately \$24 billion every day in the first 50 days of this administration. This is unprecedented spending. When you spend that fast, when you spend that much, it is no wonder you make mistakes like this AIG fiasco we had last week.

So again, the contrast could not be more clear with what American families are doing in the tough economic times they face and they have to deal with versus how the Federal Government is reacting. Families are tightening their belt. They are doing what American families have had to do many other times in history when things got tough. But their government is spending at unprecedented levels and at an unprecedented pace, making mistakes as they do it. And we saw that last week.

So again I yield back to my friend and colleague and thank him for his work on this important issue.

Mr. SCALISE. I think when people look to Washington, they are looking for leadership. They are not looking for just more checks thrown around or cash thrown around to States or to people. What they want to see is policies, good sound policies to respond to the things that are happening across the country. I think people are very

concerned. We are finally starting to see people speak up and not just complain at home or sit on their couch. They are literally standing up and going to these tea parties that they are having all across the country now. In fact on April 15, the day that many of us dread, the day that we pay our taxes, that is the day that many of these tea parties are going to be held throughout the country where people are in essence revolting against this record level of spending, this record level of borrowing, deficit spending and taking money that we don't have from our kids and grandkids to run up these massive deficits each year under the President's budget.

They are doing it because they know that this hasn't happened yet. They are proposals by this President. But this is a President like any, and this is a Congress like any, that needs to respond to what people are saying across this country. And so while we are speaking on this floor tonight talking about the dangers of deficit spending and record borrowing and these taxes that are being proposed, and we are trying to stop this from happening, people across the country are doing the same thing.

I think my friend here is going to chime in as well and talk about this.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I have just a couple of comments. I was back in my district this weekend and talked to some of our local governments. My background is a physician and a local mayor. And the community that I was mayor in just before I came here is looking at making a 5 percent cut in their budget, worst case scenario. They are looking at what they have to do to balance their budget. I also talked to a town administrator of Morristown, Tennessee, this past week. They were looking at their MTPO funds. They got an extra \$720,000 in stimulus money for a bus system. To show you how out of touch the Federal Government is, they had about \$600,000 in MTPO funds, that is Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization funds, and they can buy buses with these funds and they can build bus stations. There is just one small problem in that community. Their general fund budget has got a \$1.6 million hole in it. They have 16 people they can't hire right now that they normally do. They can't afford to hire the bus drivers.

That is something that gets lost in this place up here is that we spend at these record deficits, and local communities are making these tough decisions. And they are tough decisions. Business leaders are doing exactly what they are doing with their budgets, tightening their belts. What do we do up here? In the omnibus spending bill, which I call the "ominous spending bill," when everybody else is cutting it, what are we doing? Up 8 percent. Now, how can I go back to Tennessee and explain to people that we print money—or borrow it—and then go back and spend at that level while

they are having to make these tough decisions? I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend from Tennessee for talking about the challenges as people look at what is happening up here in Washington and they are dealing with tough economic times back home. And this isn't something that families and States are new to. It seems like budgets are cyclical, sometimes you're up, sometimes you're down. But ultimately, you have to live within your means. And families are doing exactly that. Then they are looking at Washington and they are seeing what's happening up there when in just 2 months of a new administration where people were promised change, where a President stood here on this House floor just a few weeks ago and said, "We cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences." And I think we all agree with those statements. But the problem is people then look, and the next day, the very next day after the President made those statements, he files a bill that spends and borrows at record levels, \$1.7 trillion in borrowing and \$1.4 trillion in new taxes. Many of those new taxes will fall on the backs of middle class families and small businesses.

People are saying, "Wait a minute, that wasn't the change we were told about." If they made less than \$250,000, they surely didn't think they were going to see a dime of new taxes. And then they see that bill, the President's cap-and-trade bill, that actually adds roughly \$1,300 just in energy costs. The estimates are that it will be more than \$3,000 per family—not people making over \$250,000, but a middle class family or a family making maybe \$20,000 a year will see roughly \$3,000 when you count up your higher energy bill, your higher gas bill at the pump and when you go and pay for products that use energy, like food. Any food product you use there is energy, transportation, related to that. So people look at all of this combined and they say, "this doesn't add up to the things that I was hearing and that I was excited about." And so they are speaking up.

What is important is that people are not just going to sit back and let this happen. We are not going to sit back and let this happen.

I'll yield back to my friend.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. We have already had a perfect example of cap-and-trade. It was last year when oil prices went to \$147 a barrel. Every American citizen knows that that went straight out of their hip pocket. And like you pointed out, everything you buy at the grocery store, every product that is transported by energy pays for that. And we have already seen that. We know what will happen with cap-and-trade.

Mr. SCALISE. Reclaiming my time.

One other thing that was not brought up yet but a bill that was just filed about a week and a half ago that the President said that he supports is this bill called the Employee Free Choice

Act, which has just perplexed the business community throughout this country. Small businesses are literally shaking at the thought that their employee workforce and employees across this country—we have already started hearing from employees who are very angered and disappointed that Democrats in Congress would take away their right to a secret ballot vote when it comes to deciding whether or not they want to form a union. And yet that is now part of the President's agenda, an agenda item that is estimated to cost this economy in our country over 600,000 jobs in the first year in a tough economic time when we need to be creating jobs. The bill that they are filing could actually cost, run jobs out of this country to the tune of about 600,000 a year.

I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. You brought up a good point there. In fact I was talking to a manufacturer in my district not long ago about this so-called employers free—

Mr. SCALISE. Employees Free Choice Act, which it is not.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The reason I have a hard time remembering that is because there is nothing free about it. It is actually a method of trying to force unionization on employers and employees alike. It is going to cost jobs. In fact, what I just was fixing to say was that I was talking to an employer in my district who said to me that if this act passes, he is going to shut the doors, and his business is going to go offshore. And that is going to happen all over this country. It is going to cost thousands and thousands of jobs.

Why is that happening? It is happening as a payback. It is happening as a payback to the Democrats who get all this money and all the support from the labor unions because the labor unions want to make an environment where they can force unionization on small businesses and large businesses all over this country. And what is even more egregious is the forced arbitration that is in that bill that is not free either. It is totally wrong. Again, this is a steamroller of socialism being shoved down the throats of the American people. And we have got to stop it.

□ 2145

But it is going to cost jobs. And what it is going to do is it is going to put us in a bigger financial mess as a Nation. When we have the cap-and-tax placed on all energy, it is going to drive up the cost of all goods and services. Just like Dr. ROE was just talking about up in Tennessee, folks up there already saw what happened. We have already seen in Georgia what happens. People stop utilizing energy. It is going to actually cost the Federal Government money instead of—and it is going to cost jobs.

I am beginning to think that that is the purpose of all this is to try to put everybody on the government dole, try

to create a big socialistic society where everybody gets a check from the Federal Government.

But the thing is, America's hurting. America's hurting terribly. We have got to do something and we have got to do it now. But going down this road towards bigger deficits, borrowing more, spending more, taxing more is not the solution. The solution is stimulating the free enterprise system. Free enterprise is the economic engine that pulls along the train of economic security in America. And we are killing that engine. We are throttling it down, and we are shutting it off.

And we have got to create jobs. We have got to create good-paying jobs. Building a bigger government, borrowing from our children and our grandchildren, is not the solution. And so we have just got to do everything we can to stop it.

And I applaud you, Mr. SCALISE, for bringing all these issues forward because it is just absolutely critical that the American people understand what is going on.

You brought out the quote from the President. The problem is, what he says and what he does are two different things. He said he would never, never sign a bill that has earmarks in it. Well the first bill, that omnibus bill, was nothing but earmarks. It was just a payback to the liberal entities, as well as all of the liberal agenda that they have had stuck in some drawer somewhere. They just dusted them all off and brought them forth. We don't have the money to pay for that. And it markedly increases the size of government.

We saw that with the budget that he has been proposing. And everything we are going to see is, we just see over and over again, the President says one thing and he does another. He says, we cannot simply spend as we please and defer the consequences, but that is exactly what he is doing.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, reclaiming my time, one of the things that you talked about, you know, as you talk about the concern that your business people in Georgia have, I have heard the same thing from not just employers but from employees, workers in South Louisiana, who are very concerned that their ability to, their right to a secret ballot would be taken away. In fact, while it is called the Employee Free Choice Act, myself and others call it the Secret Ballot Elimination Act, because all of us in Congress, the President, even the leadership on the Democratic side, we are all elected by secret ballot. There is a secret ballot right that people have, and part of the reason for that is it protects employees from coercion and intimidation and those kind of threats that have happened throughout our history. And that is the reason that that is in place. And that a bill would be filed as part of the President's agenda that would take away somebody's right to a secret ballot, something that is at the heart of

any democracy, I think, is offensive. And it shows people which road they are going down, that while we have got problems with our economy and we need to be focused on creating jobs, they see what this administration is really focused on. Taxing people's energy bills, taxing small businesses for the work that they do, that hurts their ability to go out and create more jobs to hire people in this country. And then passing legislation that would actually take away somebody's secret ballot, it is something that has gotten people's attention. They are seeing what these deficits will do to our future, our children and our grandchildren, and people are starting to speak up. And I am glad somebody else that is going to be speaking up is my friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. There have been so many wonderful points made here. I say wonderful as an adjective, when actually it is tough to say wonderful about such a very perplexing and disconcerting issue.

One thing that I haven't heard mentioned yet is about another issue that is contained in the budget, and that is with regard to restrictions on charitable deductions. Has the gentleman mentioned that?

And I appreciate the time you yield. What struck me this weekend as I thought about President Obama and the Democratic leadership trying to restrict the deductions for charitable donations is, why would you do this? Because we know, worldwide, the best help that goes to people in need, whether they are starving or after an emergency, comes from the charities, the American charities. They can go straight in and start helping those people, whereas, our government, it has to go through the other government, often a third-world government, and sometimes we end up propping up really bad governments, just trying to help the people if we go through the government.

So why would the Democratic leadership and the President be wanting to cut down on charitable donations?

And that is when it hit me this weekend. It is about the GRE, the GRE, the Government Running Everything. That is what it is about. It is about power. That is where this restriction on deductions for charitable contributions is coming from. They want the government controlling everything. They see how philanthropic the American people are, how they want to help out of the generosity of their heart, and they say, gee, these charitable organizations, they are nongovernment organizations, NGOs are doing a great job. That ought to be us. Why don't we control that too?

When the government's job ought to be making sure there is a level playing field; everybody has an equal opportunity, not equal results, but an equal opportunity. And our job is to provide for the common defense against en-

emies, both foreign and domestic. And if we do, we go after the cheaters. That is our job.

But we have been so busy trying to run everything, we have not been going after the cheaters effectively; not on Wall Street, not in corporate America, not out there in the streets. That is what we have got to get back to.

But I appreciate the gentleman yielding. But I just had to share, that is what hit me this weekend. It is about the GRE, the government running everything. This group running things now wants all power, including the power of charitable organizations.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I thank my friend from Texas. And you know, coming from Louisiana, right after Katrina, with all of the failures of government, from the Federal Government to the State government to the local government, it was our charities, it was our faith-based organizations that were the first ones in and consistently delivered so much relief and, in fact, are still in the New Orleans area today helping people rebuild, helping families get back into homes. It is those charitable organizations that don't get anything from government in most cases. And they just do it out of the goodness of their own heart and the divine providence from the Lord. And the fact that this President's budget takes away people's ability to deduct those charitable donations, clearly threatens a lot of those organizations themselves.

And I know our time is limited. One thing we wanted to touch on as we have talked about the spending and the borrowing and the taxing, where is this money coming from?

We had actually done some research on the President's budget. And in the first 4 years, in President Obama's first 4 years in office, and I am sure that the limits on the elections will dictate if there is going to be another four, but I think as people look at this and they get more concerned, where is this money coming from? Who are we borrowing this from? This isn't money we have.

The first place the President is going in his budget is raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. And senior citizens out there who, justifiably, are dependent on that fixed income from Social Security, and future generations who want to expect something from Social Security, are very alarmed to see that in the first 4 years, the President takes over \$900 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund. And so, record levels, again, of not just borrowing, not just record levels of taxes, but record levels, never before in the history of our country have we seen nearly \$1 trillion taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund in just 4 years.

And so, as we see the record levels of spending, and people can even look at this budget and they might find items in the budget, not in the baseline budget, but new levels of spending that they might like and think sound good. But

then as they compare that against where this is coming from, is it worth adding to the Federal budget to take from Social Security, to take from our children and grandchildren, to tax small businesses and to tax every family on their energy bill? These are the questions that Americans are pondering. These are the questions we are fighting.

And I will finish with my friend from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding. One other place that they are proposing taking money from is from our defense, from procurement. They are going to take away from our troops, and that is absolutely the worst thing to do. We live in a dangerous world. And we hear people talk about we have got to support our troops. But they want to take away the procurement that is absolutely critical for us to have a strong national defense. Constitutionally, that is the major function of the Federal Government. And the liberals want to take money away from our troops who are fighting for our freedom, who are giving up and their families are giving up sometimes their lives, their limbs and a whole lot of sacrifices that they are giving. And what we are hearing from the other side is they want to take away from our troops and take away from our defense.

The anti-missile defense system is another area that they are talking about taking money from. Just last week I went and watched a rocket shoot down another rocket, a SCUD missile. It was just a phenomenal test, and they want to cancel that, which is going to make us less secure as a Nation. We can't continue down this same road. We have got to stop it.

Thank you.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend from Georgia. And that is why, we are living in challenging times, but that is why we are proposing alternatives. As we have talked about the problems of this budget, we have good alternatives we will be talking about more throughout the course of this year.

And I thank the Speaker for allowing us this time.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM IS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank you. And I thank our side of the aisle for having the opportunity to speak to our colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats tonight, about a very, very important issue. The team that just spoke, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House about much of the spending and the plans and the too much spending, too much taxing, too much borrowing theme, which is absolutely what the American public, Mr.

Speaker, needs to know about, including the plans and the spending and to have a comprehensive health care reform plan that we would vote on, we literally, Mr. Speaker, would vote on before this body and the other body goes on the traditional August recess. That is what, just barely a little more than 4 months away. And the big question is not do we need health care reform? I think my colleagues, and particularly my colleagues on this side of the aisle, who are doctor Members of this body, who are with me tonight to discuss this, the issue of health care reform, we do not disagree, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, that this needs to be done.

Nobody, whether Republican or Democrat, whether majority or minority, would want to see 47 million people in this country to have no health insurance whatsoever, and maybe another 25 million that are underinsured. And, yes, indeed, it could happen to one of my adult children and their young families. They all have decent jobs, but one major illness away from being underinsured and possibly ending up in a bankruptcy court, facing foreclosure on their homes and these kind of crises that we all agree we need to avoid.

So the reform of the health care system is not really a question of whether or not this side of the aisle agrees. We do agree. It is a matter, though, of how we do it and when we do it, and what we can afford to do. And I think that what the President has proposed so far is, just as we hear about his overall budget in a 10-year projection, and the numbers that we received over the weekend from the Congressional non-partisan budget office, of unsustainable debt, deficits that will lead to possibly doubling of the national debt within 10 years. It is something that really has to be addressed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, tonight, we are here with, I am leading the hour, but I am very pleased that some of my colleagues on the GOP Republican Doctors Caucus have joined with me. And I wanted to set the tone for what we will talk about during this hour, and that is about physician work force; and will we have the manpower, when those 47 million hopefully do have health insurance, and the under-insured are fully insured, where are we going to come up with the doctors, the health care providers, to be able to provide that care?

Having a plastic card, Mr. Speaker, that says you are covered and you have access doesn't guarantee any individual that they are going to be able to have a provider who is going to see them.

□ 2200

And my fear is that they will not be able to have that access, particularly if the majority is successful in their plans to have a government default option to go along with, let's say, Medicare and Medicaid and TRICARE and veterans' health care benefits and the CHIP program. It is just adding one

more responsibility of the Federal Government to control all of health care, and that is really what we are going to talk about tonight.

As I walked over here, Mr. Speaker—I was walking in the building, into this great Capitol House Chamber, the people's House—there was an emergency, and I saw physicians from the office of the House physician—paramedics, nurses—sprinting to the ambulance that is parked right outside this building for just such an emergency. I thought to myself, you know, thank God for the health care system that we already have. We definitely can improve upon that, and we will talk about that tonight, but thank God that we have that ability to respond in that manner.

It makes me think, Mr. Speaker, of the tragedy that occurred up in Canada in regard to this famous actress—and I will not mention her name—the tragic death of that actress after what seemed like a fairly routine, snow-skiing fall in which she got up, dusted herself off and said: I am fine. I do not need any medical care. Let me just go back to my resort hotel room. I am fine. Of course, that is what she did, and we all know now that 2 hours later, when she began to get into trouble and, maybe, passed out and a 911 call was made, it was 4 hours later that she was finally seen at a major medical center that could respond to this subdural hematoma that she obviously had developed. By that time, she was brain dead, and a life was lost, not just a life of a famous person and a prominent person but a mother of young children and of a devastated family.

So when we, Mr. Speaker, hear this talk about a single-payer system, of a government-run system not unlike the Canadian system—I am not necessarily picking on Canada. They are our good friends and neighbors to the north, but the same thing could be said, I think, about the system in the U.K. or in Taiwan or in any of the other countries that have a national health insurance, government-run program. If this accident had occurred, I think, out in Colorado in the United States, that young mother and famous actress would be alive today.

So these are some of my thoughts as we begin to discuss. I call on my colleagues, the doctor colleagues, who are with me tonight. I want to ask my colleagues to focus their attention on this first poster. It is titled "A Second Opinion," and then, of course, it is subtitled "Strengthen the Doctor-Patient Relationship." That is what we want to do, and that is what we will talk about.

With this second opinion theme, I think, most people associate a second opinion with a medical opinion, and understand that, when they go to the doctor, sometimes a second opinion is very, very valuable. In fact, I think almost always it is very valuable. So it is important when the other side of the aisle—when the majority party—says or some of their news media, co-conspirators, if you will, who support a

national health insurance program or any major issue that the majority party is promoting says, well, the Republicans, all they are is a party of "no," they do not have another alternative. They are just saying, well, we are going to stand in the way of something that we do not like because the majority party has presented it, and this is all political.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth, and that is certainly true in regard to the health care of this Nation. This second opinion theme could apply to energy; it could apply to what the previous team was talking about in regard to the budget and spending. We do have a plan on the Republican side on all of these issues and, if you will, a second opinion Republican plan on health care.

So, with that sort of setting the theme, I want to go ahead and recognize my colleagues. I am going to first call on the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my classmate who has been with me here in the House—and we are now serving our fourth term—and that is Dr. TIM MURPHY from the great State of Pennsylvania.

Dr. MURPHY, I would like to give you an opportunity to talk about some of the issues that you have been focusing on, not just as part of the Republican Doctors Caucus but since you came to Congress some 6½ years ago. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, not only for your leadership in health care but for your time here.

You know, we have many times discussed the issues involved in health care, and although I hear many people talk about the issue of accessible and affordable quality health care, very often the solution offered in this body by government is more government, and that is health care is expensive, so let's have someone pay for it—the government. Along those lines, Medicare and Medicaid oftentimes list it as, because so much is spent there—and I think Medicaid is \$350 billion a year there. Between Medicare, Medicaid and the VA, almost half of the Federal mandatory budget is spent.

The question is: Are they effective? Are they efficient? Does it have quality-based health care?

I want to bring up just a couple issues here and emphasize the importance of that doctor-patient relationship. I am a psychologist. For many years, I have worked for hospitals in the Pittsburgh region in the pediatric, maternity and general medicine settings, but I have always had a strong relationship in working with a wide range of physicians and with other health care specialists, recognizing it is a team and in letting the team do their work that you really end up with some significant savings in quality of care. Let me talk about a couple of ways that that does occur.

A recent report sent out by the New England Health Care Institute noted

that the U.S. really spends more on health care than any other nation on Earth, and many times people talk about the negatives of our health care system in terms of higher rates, for example, of infant mortality, but there are concerns about how that data is reached. I will not go into that now.

What I do want to point out, however, is that out of this \$2.3 trillion health care system, which is very expensive and gets in the way of a lot of families affording health care, one of the deep concerns, perhaps, is that 30 to 40 percent of those health care dollars are wasted. \$600 billion to \$700 billion is what is listed in this report. Let me name a couple of things that go into this. If we let the doctor-patient relationship take supremacy over this and let physicians make decisions for what patients need, there are some changes we might see.

First of all, unexplained variations in the intensity of medical and surgical procedures, including but not limited to end-of-life care, the overuse of coronary artery bypass surgery and the overuse of percutaneous coronary procedures has the potential of avoidable costs of \$600 billion. The misuse of drugs, overprescribing and underprescribing: some \$52 billion. The overuse of non-urgent Emergency Department care: the savings could be \$21 billion. The overuse of generic antihypertensives: a potential savings of \$3 billion. The list goes on.

Now the question is: Why would these conditions exist?

Well, actually, government, itself, stands in the way in many cases, and sometimes, well, it is the way health insurance is set up, but if the issue were instead that physicians could be the ones who are moving forward in this, I believe a lot of savings could take place. I believe what we should be doing as a legislative body is finding ways to break down those barriers and really helping to improve. One of the points to be made by a number of the doctors here on the floor tonight is about having more physicians involved. Let's take one of those aspects.

Having a health care home is important, and one of the health care homes for people in some areas has to do with having a community health center. Now, community health centers provide great quality of care with a wide range of medical services, as my colleagues note. Yet there is a shortage of physicians, in part, because it is not the best paying position in the world, but many physicians want to help. The strange thing about this is that, in a wide range of health care areas, if you work at a community health center, your medical malpractice insurance is paid. If you volunteer, you are on your own, and so these clinics say, We cannot possibly afford that. There are different kinds of malpractice insurance that is not important to get into at this point. We have tried a number of times to allow it so physicians could actually volunteer—so psychologists

could volunteer, so dentists, podiatrists, social workers, and nurse practitioners—but no, the government says, We cannot let you do that.

There are also areas, too, that come up here in terms of how we could let disease management work. Here is one of the strangest things that happens with Medicaid:

You know, one group that has a great deal of problems is that of people with severe diabetes. The severe diabetics, if they have problems with the circulation in their feet, for example, the real tragedy might be that they might have their feet amputated, but isn't it strange that Medicare and Medicaid will not pay for that physician or that nurse to monitor the patients closely—to call them, to work with them, to do more than just give them a pamphlet, but to work closely with them to keep them out of the hospital, to make sure that they are getting their insulin, to make sure they are monitored for their weight, et cetera, but we will not pay for that? We will pay \$50,000 for that tragic surgery that could have been avoided, but we will not pay money to help when they manage the care.

Now I might say that there is a recent study that came out that, I believe, is filled with methodological flaws, saying that disease management has some questionable applications. Unfortunately, they focused on those who oftentimes had the most severe illnesses. As I am sure many of the physicians here tonight can attest, the real value is getting to that patient early or when the complications begin to show up rather than to wait until the end. I know, in my career as a psychologist, I had a patient who is now a deeply depressed, suicidal inpatient. When you could have been working with them years before, it makes a big difference in their outcomes.

We have to make sure that the system that we allow here with health insurance and with physicians working with patients really allows for a great deal of predischARGE planning, of working closely and individualizing that care and for making sure that it is there.

Let me mention a couple of other things as we proceed forward. Recent legislation under the House set aside nearly \$2 billion to help physician practices have health information technology. A good idea. The question is how it is done. If that health information technology is merely paying for keeping hospital records on a computer, that is not going to be enough because that is a passive system that only makes it a little easier to pull up records rather than having to wait for the records to arrive.

What we need is a smart, interactive system that is portable for the patient so that records follow the patient, not so that patients follow the records. We have to make sure it is private, that confidentiality is protected, and we have to make sure it is personal so that the relationship between doctor



and patient is what is paramount here. That physician and information they are obtaining and what they are writing whenever they have a diagnosis is a smart record that also helps provide information to that doctor about best practices, about feedback, about prescriptions, and even about the feedback of whether or not that patient got that prescription and if he is following through. It is all of those things. In today's world, because there is a shortage of physicians and because insurance with Medicare, Medicaid or private insurance oftentimes does not pay for having the physician actually work to follow up with the patient, then that health IT is just one, big, expensive thing on the desk of the physician, and it is not really providing the care they need.

Let me mention one other thing here, and that has to do with point of care lab tests. The system we have designed is one where—and because some physicians have been found when they own the labs—the concern was were they overprescribing lab tests. I would love to hear some input from my physician colleagues on that, too. So what did they say? They said, Let's not allow physicians to do this at all, where sometimes the most valuable thing is if the physician says, I need an x-ray; I need a lab test; I need this information right away. Instead, they have to send that patient out to a lab or send the information out. It could be a couple of weeks before they would get it back.

The best way to improve patient compliance is quicker information. Even to allow, for example, pharmacies and drug stores to provide some of this lab information would be more valuable. All this feeds into the system that part of the way to save the \$600 billion or \$700 billion worth of loss in the health care system is to put the tools in the hands of those who provide the health care. Make sure there are enough physicians. Make sure they have the tools they need so that as they diagnose, as they prescribe, as they work with other colleagues in the health care field that that information is shared in an effective way that is personal, that is private, that is portable, and actually that is permanent, too. These are not records that are lost as a person moves on to another health care plan or whatever they do in life.

Part of what we are doing here as the GOP Doctors Caucus is operating on the idea that we are all gathered together here to really work on making sure that we are developing patient-centered, patient-driven health care reforms based on quality, access, affordability, portability, and choice. Over the coming months, you will hear from us continually speak about this because we believe we have a health care system that can be based upon those, that can save massive amounts of money and that can save hundreds of thousands of lives. That needs to be our goal, not only to do no harm but to make sure we put health care back in

the hands of those making those health care decisions. In so doing, we go at the very thing that people are raising the concerns about, and that is making health care more affordable and more accessible with quality as the underlying point.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 2215

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my colleague, my co-chairman of the GOP Doctors Caucus and of all of the important points, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. MURPHY brought to us. That point he made about the doctor-patient relationship being paramount I think is the most important. And that is our concern that if we go to a government-run, totally government-run system, that that will be sacrificed and that will be sacrificed badly.

Before I yield to my colleague, Dr. FLEMING from Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to draw my colleagues' attention to this next slide in regard to the supply/demand crisis.

Even if nothing changed under the current system, we already have a shortage. And it will only get worse as we approach the year 2025. There are a lot of reasons that. Growth in an aging population. There is an immense physician shortage on the horizon. It is expected by 2025 to be a shortage by 125,000 physicians, and the demand for care by that time will increase by 26 percent.

Now, the bulk of the shortage—and these are statistics from the Association of the American Medical College; this was a center for workforce studies back in 2008, so just a year ago—but the bulk of that shortage, in fact, 37 percent of the projected shortage, is in primary care physicians. And I don't disagree with President Obama and the majority party in regard to the need to get more primary care physicians, to have these medical homes that we talk about, to stress wellness. And that is so important.

So it couldn't be more timely for me to call on Dr. FLEMING, who—he specializes in family practice, and has for a number of years, in south Louisiana.

And it is indeed a pleasure to yield time now to Dr. JOHN FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And also I want to thank Doctors MURPHY and GINGREY in your leadership on this subject and your years in Congress.

I want to say first of all, Mr. Speaker, that health care in the United States is among the best in the world, but the financing of it is a basket case. We have 47 million uninsured Americans and they are not who you think they are. They are not the poor; they have Medicaid. They are not the elderly; they have Medicare. They are not workers for large corporations or the government, such as us tonight. They are owners of small businesses and their employees. They have tremendous difficulty acquiring affordable insurance. And I see this every day.

I, myself, am a small business owner apart from being a family physician with still an active practice. And what is, in fact, going on in this situation is this: the risk pool for a small business is very small, and all it takes is one heart transplant or certainly renal dialysis and it can blow the whole plan up; everybody in the company can find themselves without insurance.

Well, I think that we, on the GOP side, we Republicans, and certainly we Republican physicians, agree with the other side and also with our President that we do need comprehensive health care. We need access to health care and coverage for all Americans.

And in fact, when you think about it with the entitled laws in the 1980s, every American today is entitled to health care regardless of his ability to pay. And if you don't believe me, go to an emergency room demanding care, and you will receive that care without anyone asking about your ability to pay. And that is certainly an honorable and laudable value that we have.

The problem is that that same individual probably has an illness such as diabetes or hypertension, which, if they had received care early in the disease or maybe in a stage of prevention, would not only not be in the emergency room, but the outcome would be much better and the cost would be much lower.

So, you see, when someone goes to the emergency room or staggers into an emergency room perhaps on their death bed and we providers have to pull them out, somebody gets a bill for that. And that bill is going to be many times higher than what it would have been otherwise. This, of course, creates bankruptcies. Many families end up filing bankruptcy after going through a major thing like this. So who absorbs that cost? The cost is absorbed by those who pay insurance premiums and taxpayers.

So it is not free medicine. So since we're already providing the resources, why not front-load that into preventative and early diagnostic care?

I am a strong believer in health care reform, and I will just tick through several of them that I think need to be implemented with all dispatch.

First, we need to have portability. Dr. MURPHY mentioned that before. We do need to go to electronic health records in a way that is going to make practices more efficient. We need to do away with archaic insurance laws which cause these small risk pools. We need to create large risk pools and make "pre-existing illness" a term that is no longer in the American lexicon.

We need to make sure that everyone gets basic private health care insurance, and I think that family physicians should be the linchpin in health care because it has been proven time and time again that family physicians, the primary care providers, create a much more efficient form of health care, but they also work very closely

with their colleagues to ensure that they get uploaded or downloaded or whatever is necessary in order to get the best.

But let me comment on one more thing before I yield. And that is that we're right now in a crossroads of decision making. We all agree that we need comprehensive health care reform. The question is will it be a single-payer governmental system such as what we have today with Medicare or Medicaid, or will it be a private health care system?

Now if we expand Medicare to include everyone, as some have suggested in this body, what is going to absorb that overflow and cost?

You see today, Medicare is somewhat successful in that the fraud, abuse, and the waste is being absorbed by the taxpayer and also those who pay private subscription rates. When we go to an entire system that is a single payer Medicare system, there will be nobody to pick up the tab at that point. So what are we left with?

Well, number one, we know that when you have a government-type system, a micromanaged system from the top, you end up with spot shortages, which we already have today; and I am sure that Dr. GINGREY will discuss that further. But also you have a situation beyond the spot shortages that is how do you control costs? And government can control costs only one way, and that is rationing. That means that somebody is told "no" when there is in fact something that can be done.

On the other hand, you take a private system, even if it's funded by government entities, either partially or in whole, if it's administered privately, it is far more efficient. And I will just give you a quick example.

Today, we talk about fraud and abuse and waste. And how can we find this fraud and abuse and what do we do about it? Well, we have to go after it legally to prosecute it. It is very expensive. You only find the tip of the iceberg. In a private plan, everyone works to build efficiency in the system, and if someone is just a little bit off the graph, you reeducate, you help them, or if they don't respond, you terminate them. You don't have to worry about finding someone who is manufacturing health claims or any of that kind of nonsense. It just doesn't happen.

So the bottom line is we need to get physicians, all providers, on board with working towards a much more efficient system, and we need to get the patients involved as well.

For many years, as my colleagues here, I know, have experienced, you couldn't talk patients into accepting generic drugs. Today with the tiered payment systems, the incentives are in favor of generic drugs, and now you can't beg patients not to take generic medications because they are much cheaper.

So there is a lot of work that we need to do, Mr. Speaker, and these are just some of the suggestions.

But finally, I would just like to say that we need to do a lot more to improve the availability, particularly of primary care providers, and we're going to have to do that by increasing the reimbursement rates because what we're really getting is a paradoxical effect. The more we clamp down reimbursement rates for family physicians and others, the more they have to do other things to make up the difference, which echoes costs throughout the system.

So thank you.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, the good doctor.

And, you know, again, stressing this theme of going forward, the shortage of manpower, it has a lot to do with physician satisfaction in their chosen profession. And I think that is basically what we want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that everybody, all of our colleagues understand on both sides of the aisle, that as Dr. FLEMING was saying, if you have access to an affordable health insurance policy, as we all hope and pray for those 47 million, if it's a system that is run by the government and we crowd out the private market completely—and that is one of my big fears and I think that of my colleagues—then these young men and women that normally would—our best and brightest who would normally want to go to medical school and maybe become a family practitioner and provide this care, they are not going to do it. They are going to choose another profession. They are going to maybe become lawyers, but not doctors. And I think that is a big concern.

And I don't think anybody knows more about this than the next person that I will yield to, Dr. PHIL ROE, a fellow OB-GYN physician, who has provided women's care and delivered lots of babies in the Tri-City area of Tennessee—Kingsport, Bristol, Johnson City—and he knows of what he speaks. And I think he's going to talk to us a little bit about what probably everybody in this Chamber is aware of, and that is something called TIN care in Tennessee, and I am happy to yield to my colleague, a freshman representative doing a wonderful job, Dr. PHIL ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. A couple of things to historically go back over, and I might mention that if the public out there that is watching this tonight thinks that the government's management of AIG is good, then they are going to be thrilled to death with the government management of health care, I can tell you that.

I am going to go through a couple of historical things.

You and I went through the managed care in all of the 1990s and all of the promises that were going to occur, the cost savings and so forth, that didn't show up; and one of the things that concerned me about health care going forward is accessibility, not just in

physicians but in other health care providers.

For instance, our nursing staff. By 2016—that is 7 years from now—we're going to need one million more registered nurses in this country. And in the next 8–10 years, more physicians will be retiring and dying than we're producing in this country.

And let me go back a few years to read this to us just briefly. It is a 1994 report to both Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the National Council on Graduate Medical Education noted, "In a managed care dominated health care system, the Bureau of Health Professions Commissions projects a year 2000 shortage of 35,000 generalist physicians and a surplus of 115,000 specialist physicians" and recommended that the "nation 'produce 25 percent fewer physicians annually.'" That was just 13 years ago.

"In 1995, the PEW Commission recommended medical schools 'by 2005 reduce the size of entering medical school class in the U.S. by 20–25 percent,' arguing further that this reduction should come from the closure of existing medical schools."

Have you ever heard of anything as ridiculous as that? And think of what a catastrophe that would have been had we followed this.

The Institute of Medicine committee "recommended 'no new schools of allopathic or osteopathic medicine be opened, that class sizes in existing schools not be increased, and that public funds not be made available to open new schools or expand class sizes.'"

Now, to give you an example just to reiterate what you said, if physicians don't retire—and there are over a quarter of a million physicians over the age of 55; that is a third of the practicing doctors in America—do retire in the next 10 years, which they most certainly will, this number—and the reason that is so important for the folks listening is is the access to care. What happens will be that patients won't have access to their physicians, and I have seen that.

I have practiced and trained in Memphis, inner-city Memphis and a rural area where I am now, and you all know inner-cities and the rural areas are the two most underserved areas in America now.

□ 2230

Patients in those areas are now not only having a difficult time paying for care, just finding someone to give them the care. So this particular recommendation that was made, if it had been followed, would have been an utter disaster for the American health care system.

We need to encourage more and more young people. The community where I live has a Quillen College of Medicine, has 26 students. It hasn't increased the class size in 20 years. Why? They don't have funding to do it, and we have a tremendous shortage of primary care physicians.

At the end of my practice last year when I was still in the operating room, one of the most difficult things I had to do was find a primary care provider for a post-surgical patient. It is difficult to do now, and it is going to get much, much, much worse.

I will mention a couple of things about our TennCare system, and it was a system that was started with noble objectives, to provide care for all Tennesseans. It was rapidly put together, and I heard you say at the beginning of this, we don't need to do this fast; we need to do this right. It's to important.

The health care that we provide affects every citizen in this country. Every one of us is going to have to abide by this system, and who should be in control of that system are the patients and the physicians. That's who should be making these health care decisions.

Now, in a survey that was done in the current budget crisis in the State, the State was about \$1 billion short before the stimulus package came along. And what the stimulus package does is simply put off these hard decisions for about 2 years in our State. But that survey showed that nearly half the physicians in the State of Tennessee would end their participation or consider ending their participation in one or both of the MCOs in the State—that's the medical care organizations—if those cuts were enacted to ease the State budget crisis, and another 31 percent said they would reduce the number of TennCare patients they're seeing. That's 80 percent either would stop or reduce the number that they're currently seeing.

I spoke to one of our large hospital administrators this past weekend, and right now, we have TennCare covering 60 percent of hospital costs. Medicare covers about 90 percent of hospital costs. The uninsured obviously cover none of the costs, and the private payers have to make up that difference to keep the hospital open.

You hear that your medical benefits are tax deductible and so forth. Well, I would argue they're not. If you go ahead, that's a hidden tax right there that a person who has private health insurance has to pay when they pay it. Now I know this year because in the past year, I bought my own policy. I've a health savings account, and to buy this health savings account, I was fortunate to be able to do that. It is about \$1,000 a month, but I had to earn about \$18,000 to pay that after taxes. So, for a person with a health savings account or a small business or whatever, they're on your own, you're in real trouble in this country now.

And I think the health care plan in this country should have about four principles. One is a basic health plan for all Americans, and we can define that a lot of ways, but I think one of the ways you could define it is the least expensive government plan.

And number two, illness should not bankrupt you. If you get sick, if you

develop multiple myeloma or a malignancy or something or at no cause of your own, you should not be bankrupted by that illness.

And number three, it should be portable. You should be able to move. If you lose your job, as many people have done during this current recession, you should be able to carry your health benefits along and not have COBRA payments that people with expensive, who let's say Bill Gates would have a hard time paying.

So I look forward to continuing this discussion in the future.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Well, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee and the words of the wisdom that he brought us to.

Before I yield to my colleague from Georgia, I want to just make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, about some of the statistics in regard to physician workforce shortage. Any my State, my home State of Georgia, it's ranked 40th in the Nation with respect to active physicians per 100,000 people. In Georgia, there are 204 per 100,000. National average is 250.

Georgia also has the dubious ranking of 44th in the Nation with respect to active primary care physicians. You just heard that from Dr. FLEMING, and you will hear it in just a minute from Dr. PAUL BROWN, a family practitioner in Georgia.

Seventy-three primary care physicians per 100,000 in Georgia; the national average, 88.1. Eighty-nine percent of job seekers graduating from Georgia medical residency programs received and accepted job offers in 2004 but only 54 percent of them stayed in my great State of Georgia.

So just kind of bringing home some of the statistics from where we live and represent.

At this time, I'm proud to yield to Dr. PAUL BROWN, the gentleman who represents my hometown of Augusta, Georgia, and Athens, Georgia, the home of the University of Georgia, the great bulldog nation and many, many wonderful counties in between.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PAUL BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY. I appreciate you bringing these very important points to the floor tonight.

I want to talk about the issue that you just brought up about the lack of primary care physicians in our home State of Georgia, but before I do that, I wanted to remark about something Dr. MURPHY brought up tonight, and that's the cost of regulatory burden on the health care system, particularly as it deals with lab and X-ray and those types of things.

I want to give an example. Back a number of years ago, I was practicing medicine in rural south Georgia, and Congress passed a bill called the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act. It was signed into law. It's called CLIA. I had a small lab in my office, totally quality controlled, wanted to make

sure that the tests that I did there were accurate so that I could give the best quality care to my patients that I possibly was trained to do.

And CLIA shut down that lab. Well, why? Well, the reason that CLIA shut down the lab was that the people here in Congress decided that it was a conflict of interest for doctors to own labs and that they may be an overutilization. But the thing is, what this has done is it's markedly driven up the cost of health care for all of us, the cost of insurance, and it made insurance less affordable.

Now, to show you how that works is that in my lab, if a patient came to see me with a red, sore throat, maybe had little white patches on their throat, running a fever, coughing, aching all over, runny nose, this could be a strep throat, need a penicillin shot or some antibiotics. It could be a viral infection. They look exactly the same. I would do a test in my office called the complete blood count, or CBC. It took 5 minutes to do the test. I charged \$12 for the test. I made 50 cents on it, if any at all.

Well, CLIA shut down my lab. I couldn't do those tests any longer. If patients came in with those same symptoms, I had to decide whether just to go ahead and give them antibiotics and expose them to the overutilization of antibiotics that, not only the exposure to them which could create superinfections, also increases the cost, because the overutilization of antibiotics markedly drives up the costs for all of us. Or I would do the test, and to do so, I would have to send them over to the hospital to get that done. It would take 2 to 3 hours to do a test I could do in 5 minutes, and it cost \$75 whereas the test in my office cost \$12.

You can see what that one test, the cost across the whole health care system has been for that one test for patients that come in with sore throats which is a very common illness that primary care physicians, like I, see.

So the regulatory burden on the system markedly increases the cost and makes it less affordable. So if we could get the regulatory burden off of the health care system, it would literally lower the cost of insurance and would make it more affordable.

We actually hear of about 47 million people in this country not having health care. Well, everybody has health care. As Dr. FLEMING was talking about, entitlement laws made it so that people could go to the emergency room and get health care. So everybody has access to health care. Everybody can get health care. The question is where do they get it, at what cost, and who pays for it.

Well, if we go to a socialized medicine system—and the code word for socialized medicine in this body here is comprehensive health care reform—if we go to socialized health care, it's going to make it less affordable and be harder for people to get health care, provided to them.

But in Georgia, we have a tremendous lack of primary care doctors. In fact, in more than one-third of the counties—we have 159 counties in the State of Georgia. Fifty-eight of those counties, over a third, are officially designated as primary health professional shortage areas. This means on average that there is less than one doctor per 3,500 people in those counties. About 1.5 million people in the State of Georgia alone are affected by the shortage of doctors.

We need in Georgia 259 more doctors to serve those underserved areas, just to fill that official estimate of shortage, and ideally, in fact, the experts say that there should be one doctor per 2,000 people. To attain that goal, we would need another 421 doctors, primary care providers, to face that shortage.

Now, the Medical College of Georgia, my school that I graduated from, is just expanding and developing new campuses. There's one that's going to start accepting their new class in Athens, and they're going to have other communities around the State of Georgia to try to train physicians. But we've got to give doctors the freedom to practice medicine, not put constraints on them, not to shackle them. We've got to get the regulatory burden off of their practices so they can practice medicine without all this government intrusion so they can give the care that they're trained to give.

And going down this road of socialized medicine that this administration and that the liberal leadership here in Congress is pushing us towards is going to hurt the health care system. It's going to create a larger doctor shortage, and it's going to mean that people have less access to care, particularly good, quality care.

So we need to have a patient-focused health care reform and not a government-focused health care reform, which is what we and the Doctors Caucus, what the Republican party is bringing forth as the solution to the health care crisis, which is actually a health care financing crisis, not a health care crisis in itself.

So I thank the gentleman for bringing this up tonight. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I look forward to working with our colleagues so that we can actually find some common-sense, market-based solutions that we propose and, hopefully, the American people will demand it from their Member of Congress so that we can continue to give good, quality health care here in America.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my colleague, Dr. BROWN, for joining with us in this hour, talking about the issue of strengthening the doctor-patient relationship and not destroying it.

And as Dr. BROWN pointed out in some of his statistics, those shortages that he was talking about in the State of Georgia—and this is applicable to 49 other States as well—we're talking

about under the current system. But once we cover the 47 million uninsured, and these numbers just get that much more difficult, and actually the shortage increases by 4 percent, and these statistics are frightening.

And before I introduce the next speaker, my colleague from Texas, my fellow OB/GYN colleague, I wanted my colleagues to see this next slide. And part of the reason of this physician shortage—and as I say, it will only get worse in the future—is declining reimbursement ranked as the number one impediment to the delivery of patient care.

Sixty-five percent of physicians surveyed said that Medicaid pays less than the cost of providing that care, and 35 percent of the physicians surveyed said Medicare pays less than cost of providing that care. Nobody in this House of Representatives has worked harder than my classmate, the good OB/GYN doctor from Plano, Dallas-Fort Worth. He has worked so hard to try to provide a reimbursement based on a reasonable formula and not this current sustainable growth rate.

Nobody can really understand how that's ever figured, but doctors know that every year it's figured in a cut in their reimbursement, and that indeed, Mr. Speaker, is not sustainable.

And with that, I yield to my colleague from Texas, Dr. BURGESS.

□ 2245

Mr. BURGESS. I want to thank my friend for yielding. I should mention, of course, you know we passed out of our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, just 2 weeks ago, H.R. 914, which would have, for the first time, increased the number of primary care residencies available. It was a self-replenishing loan program. Oftentimes, the biggest barrier to entry for a hospital that doesn't currently offer a residency program, the biggest barrier for entry is the cost for getting into that residency program. This will provide an ongoing self-replenishing series of loans.

We have been held up a little bit by the Office of Management and Budget. It is one of the weird things that happens to you here in Washington. Last year's Congressional Budget Office said this bill was not a problem financially. Last year's Congressional Budget Office is this year's Office of Management and Budget. And this year's Office of Management and Budget says, Wait a minute. If you make more primary care doctors, they're going to see more folks and they're going to send in more bills. It's going to cost more money. So we can't have that.

We've kind of reached a little bit of an impasse there. I hope to get past that. It just underscores sometimes the futility of working in this environment in which we find ourselves.

Now, just a few weeks ago I was fortunate enough to be asked down to the White House to participate in the health care summit, and President

Obama, to his credit, as he was wrapping things up said, Look, I just want to figure out what works.

Well, I'm here to help him. I'm so glad to hear him say that. He says, The cake was not already baked. We would work through this in our congressional committees. He'll provide guideposts and guidelines. At the end of the day, it's going to be a congressional decision.

I applaud him if that's the case. I still have some reservations deep down inside that this bill has already been written in the Speaker's office. But I will take the President at his word because, after all, we are charged in the practice of medicine for following evidence-based practice. We are told to practice evidence-based medicine. We as policymakers should also practice evidence-based policy as well.

The reform discussion has centered primarily on the number of Americans who lack insurance. That's understandable. It's a good reason. The number is astonishingly high—and growing.

But, honestly, we do have to look beyond just the single knee-jerk, silver bullet response to, We want to fix the number of uninsured. Because that may not solve our problem.

We have a grand national experiment going on in the State of Massachusetts right now. A great increase in coverage because of an individual mandate. But we have a problem. We don't quite have the number of primary care physicians required to render the care to all those folks who now have that coverage.

So, across the Nation issues with the medical workforce are going to continue to loom large and, like my colleague from Tennessee, I can remember sitting in those medical meetings 15 years ago and hearing the stories about how we were over provided. I didn't even know that was a verb, quite honestly. We were over provided in health care in this country, and we needed to scale back the number of doctors we were producing.

Now, 15 years later, that sounds like nonsense. When you consider the length of time that it takes to make one of us, those of us who are on the House floor late tonight. I don't know. Certainly, 12 years after college and my professional education, it is not at all an uncommon story. It takes a long time to make one of us.

So changes in that pipeline really can have a dramatic effect down the road. It's so important for us to get the policy right.

Another point on our Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health. Last fall, we heard from a woman who's a pediatrician in rural Alabama. It sticks in my mind because she went into practice the same year that I did—1981. She has worked her heart out there taking care of poor kids in rural Alabama.

Her practice currently has reached a point where it's 70 to 80 percent Medicaid. And she can't keep her doors open. She's having to borrow from her

retirement plan in order to pay the overhead for her office to keep the clinic doors open.

Well, I learned that lesson a long time ago with managed care back in the 1990s. If you're losing a little bit on every patient, it gets harder to make it up in volume. The harder you work, the more behind you get.

That was exactly the situation that she had found herself in. It's because we require such a significant amount of cross-subsidization. The private sector has to cross-subsidize the public sector—Medicare or Medicaid—or doctors cannot afford to keep their doors open. Precisely the information you have up on your slide.

Government-administered health care misleads Americans into thinking that they have coverage. But the reality is they're denied care at the out end because there simply is not the doctors offices there to provide it.

Well, you have been very generous with your time. I'm going to yield back so we can hear from some of our other great colleagues who are on the floor with us tonight. I thank you for bringing this hour together.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee, Dr. BURGESS.

I want to yield to another of my physician colleagues from Georgia, Dr. TOM PRICE, an orthopedic surgeon who represents the district adjacent to mine, the Sixth District of Georgia.

Dr. PRICE is going to tell us a little bit about these 47 million uninsured, many of whom are employed and simply cannot afford what is offered by their employer, their portion of the premium, and many of them of course work for very small employers that can't afford to offer coverage at all.

At this point, I am proud to yield to my colleague, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Dr. TOM PRICE.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY, for yielding and for his leadership in this area and for organizing this hour this evening.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard a lot of conversation tonight about health care and about access and affordability and quality and primary care physicians. I think it's important to talk about the thing that all of those affect, and that is patients. Patients are what this is all about.

I'm pleased to join my physician colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle tonight to talk about patients and the effect of health care and national health care policy on patients.

If I think about the eight physicians who are here on the floor tonight, we probably have seen a half million patients in our professional life and get a sense about what it means to take care of people and make certain that they get well, depending on the malady that befalls them.

We all have our different principles about health care. Mine are five—the

usual three: Access and affordability and quality. Then I add innovation and responsiveness. I think it's imperative we have a system that has the greatest amount of access, the greatest amount of affordability, the highest quality, and the most responsive and most innovative system.

I would suggest, as I know my friend would agree from Georgia, and my other physician colleagues here, that governmental intervention and increasing involvement doesn't improve any of those things. It doesn't improve access, it doesn't improve affordability, it certainly doesn't improve quality, doesn't improve innovation or responsiveness.

So what's the solution? What's the solution for the patients across this Nation who are maybe watching this evening, Mr. Speaker, and saying: What are you going to do?

Well, the solution, I believe, as I know my colleagues do, is to make certain that patients have ownership of the system. The only way to get the system to move in the direction that patients want it to move is to have a patient-centered system so that patients own and control their own health insurance policy.

Everybody's got to have health insurance. You can get to that system in a way that most of us support, which is through the Tax Code. Making certain that it makes financial sense for all patients to have health insurance. But, once they do, how do you make the system move in the direction it ought to move, and that is the direction that patients want it to move. It's to allow for patients to own and control their health insurance policy, regardless of who's paying the cost.

That's important because that changes the relationship between the insurance company and the patient. Right now, when the patient calls the insurance company and says, You're not doing what I need to have done, or my doctor recommends, the insurance company, by and large, says, Call somebody who cares. Because you aren't controlling the system.

When patients own and control the system, then the system moves in the direction that patients want it to move.

We are working diligently to come up with a product that will allow the American people to look to Washington and say, Hey, those guys are doing what we think ought to be done in our health care system.

I'm so pleased to be able to join you tonight and talk about positive solutions for our health care system that puts patients in control.

I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. PRICE, thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that we are running very close to that witching hour. Maybe I saved the best until last. He probably thinks that I'm shorting him on time because his LSU Tigers whipped up pretty badly on my Georgia

Tech Yellow Jackets in the Bowl game. That's not the case at all.

I'm proud to yield to the internist and gastroenterologist from Baton Rouge, Dr. Patrick.

Mr. CASSIDY. You're so bitter about that loss, you call me Patrick instead of CASSIDY.

I actually teach residents. I'm still on faculty with LSU Med School. It's not accidental that we end up having too few specialists.

For example, just to put the issue into focus, only about 2 percent of medical school grads in 2007 planned to go into a primary care career. That's 2 percent.

Now, it's not accidental why this is. As it turns out, the Federal Government gives more money to train specialists. It gives less to train a generalist and more to train a specialist.

When you're out, reimbursement is less for visits, but more for procedures. So the primary care physician that we don't have enough of gets paid less for the amount of effort he or she puts into their job.

So I say this to say that it's Federal policies that have gotten us here, and there are wise Federal policies that can get us out. But I want to just give a little bit of humility to the people who want to remake our system, assuming that a top-down approach will benefit.

I echo what Dr. PRICE said—it's better to have that patient in charge of the system. When it's top down, we end up with systems which end up skewing us towards more specialists and fewer generalists. I think if we take history as a guide, we will say that we will be much better if the patient have the power as opposed to CMS or another Federal bureaucracy having the power.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Patrick. And I thank all of my colleagues. You can see the level of interest of the GOP Doctors Caucus. But we want to work with the physicians, the medical providers, the nurses on the other side of the aisle, and work in a bipartisan way.

In this area of a second opinion, we will continue to bring other issues forward as we continue in the 111th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield back.

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2009 AT PAGE H3701

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on March 18, 2009 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1127. To extend certain immigration programs.

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on March 19, 2009 she presented to the President of the

United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1541. To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. WESTMORELAND (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today and March 30.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 30.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, March 24, 25 and 26.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 30.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, March 25.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, March 25.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1512. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 24, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

986. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the study of adverse health events of exposure to depleted uranium munitions on both soldiers and children of uranium-exposed soldiers who were born after the soldiers were exposed to depleted uranium, pursuant to Section 716 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007; to the Committee on Armed Services.

987. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation & Regulations on behalf of Board, Board of Directors of the HOPE for Homeowners Program, transmitting the Board's final rule — Rules Regarding Access to Information Under the Freedom of Information Act [Docket No.: B-2009-F04] (RIN: 2580-AA02) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

988. A letter from the Vice Chair and First Vice President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

989. A letter from the Vice Chair and First Vice President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Japan pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

990. A letter from the Vice Chair and First Vice President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Mexico pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

991. A letter from the Director, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Japan pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

992. A letter from the Vice Chair and First Vice President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

993. A letter from the Director, Office of Legal Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Risk Based Assessments (RIN: 3064-AD35) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

994. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's thirty-first annual report summarizing actions the Commission took during 2008 with respect to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. 1692-1692o; to the Committee on Financial Services.

995. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting notification of a grant award for the San Mateo County Community College Dis-

trict in response to the Solicitation for Grant Applications (SGA), SGA/DFA PY 08-02, as part of the Department's competitive Community-Based Job Training Initiative; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

996. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received March 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

997. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Institutional Review Boards; Registration Requirements [Docket No.: FDA-2004-N-0117] (formerly Docket No.: 2004N-0242) (RIN: 0910-AB88) received March 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

998. A letter from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's annual Alternative Fuel Vehicle Report for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to Section 8 of the Energy Conservation Reauthorization Act of 1998; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

999. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Scranton, Pennsylvania) [MB Docket No.: 08-125 RM-11457] received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1000. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed technical assistance agreement for the export of technical data, defense services, and defense articles to India (Transmittal No. DDTC 018-09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 39, 36(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1001. A letter from the Vice Admiral, USN Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting reports submitted in accordance with Sections 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the 24 March 1979 Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations for the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2009, 1 October 2008 — 31 December 2008; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1002. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Mexico for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 09-18), pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1003. A letter from the Vice Admiral, USN Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Agency's report in accordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1004. A letter from the Secretary General, Inter-Parliamentary Union, transmitting a letter enlisting support for the new democracy project that addresses the representation of minorities and indigenous peoples in national parliaments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1005. A letter from the Director, Department of Making Pregnancy Safer, World Health Organization, transmitting notification of a three-day meeting to share experiences between policy-makers and planners, and to increase advocacy to boost investments and significantly improve progress on



maternal and newborn health and survival; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1006. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive and Director, Office of Acquisition Management, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on Fiscal Year 2008 Commercial Services Management efforts, pursuant to Public Law 108-199, section 647(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1007. A letter from the Acting Assoc. Gen. Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1008. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's annual report for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1009. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's report on its competitive sourcing efforts for Fiscal Year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 108-199, section 647(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1010. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Annual Report on the Administration of the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2008, pursuant to Public Law 94-409 and Public Law 104-66; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1011. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of Santa Clara, California, as a Nonappropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AL74) received March 13, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1012. A letter from the Associate Legal Counsel, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1013. A letter from the Acting Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1014. A letter from the Co-Chief Privacy Officer, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's Privacy Act Report for fiscal year 2008, pursuant to Section 522 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act for 2005; to the Committee on House Administration.

1015. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing *Phyllostegia hispida* (No Common Name) as Endangered Throughout Its Range [FWS-R1-ES-2008-0016; MO 9221050083-B2] (RIN: 1018-AV00) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1016. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Louisiana Black Bear (*Ursus americanus luteolus*) [FWS-R4-ES-2008-0047 92210-1117-0000-B4] (RIN: 1018-AV52) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1017. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oce-

anic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2008 Report on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees, pursuant to Section 302(j) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1018. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan [Docket No.: 090213177-9179-01] (RIN: 0648-XN40) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1019. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2009 and 2010 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XL28) received March 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1020. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Oklahoma Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1021. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Mississippi Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1022. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — EXTENSION OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS IMPOSED ON ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL FROM HONDURAS [CBP Dec. 09-05] (RIN: 1505-AC11) received March 5, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1023. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Representative Payment Under Titles II, VIII and XVI of the Social Security Act [Docket No.: SSA 2008-0007] (RIN: 0960-AG70) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1024. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Expiration Date Extension for Musculoskeletal Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2008-0070] (RIN: 0960-AG93) received March 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES OF PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1107. A bill to enact certain laws relating to public contracts as title 41, United States Code, "Public Contracts" (Rept. 111-42). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 479. A bill to amend the

Public Health Service Act to provide a means for continued improvement in emergency medical services for children; with an amendment (Rept. 111-43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1246. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act regarding early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of hearing loss (Rept. 111-44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 307. A bill to enhance and further research into paralysis and to improve rehabilitation and the quality of life for persons living with paralysis and other physical disabilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 577. A bill to establish a grant program to provide vision care to children, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 756. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to pain care (Rept. 111-47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 20. A bill to provide for research on, and services for individuals with, postpartum depression and psychosis; with an amendment (Rept. 111-48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1659. A bill to amend the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act to require the Presidential designee responsible for carrying out Federal functions under the Act to have experience in election administration and be approved by the Senate, to establish the Overseas Voting Advisory Board to oversee the administration of the Act so that American citizens who live overseas or serve in the military can participate in elections for public office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCHUGH (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 1660. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a special rule for the period of admission of H-2A non-immigrants employed as dairy workers and sheepherders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 1661. A bill to establish a health registry to ensure that certain individuals who may have been exposed to formaldehyde in a

travel trailer have an opportunity to register for such registry and receive medical treatment for such exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 1662. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require child care providers to provide to parents information regarding whether such providers carry current liability insurance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SHULER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROYCE, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 1663. A bill to require State and local law enforcement agencies to determine the immigration status of all individuals arrested by such agencies for a felony, to require such agencies to report to the Secretary of Homeland Security when they have arrested for a felony an alien unlawfully present in the United States, to require mandatory Federal detention of such individuals pending removal in cases where they are not otherwise detained, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAYSON (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H.R. 1664. A bill to amend the executive compensation provisions of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 to prohibit unreasonable and excessive compensation and compensation not based on performance standards; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MICA, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 1665. A bill to structure Coast Guard acquisition processes and policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SIREs, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an auction and revenue collection mechanism for a carbon market that ensures price stability with environmental integrity; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 1667. A bill to prohibit profiteering and fraud relating to military action, relief, and reconstruction efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 1668. A bill to debar or suspend contractors from Federal contracting for unlaw-

ful employment of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia:

H.R. 1669. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a market for municipal securities, to require cooperation between the Secretary and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in addressing the municipal securities market situation including through the establishment of municipal securities funding facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1670. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide individuals with disabilities and older Americans with equal access to community-based attendant services and supports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WU, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. SPACE):

H.R. 1671. A bill to understand and comprehensively address the oral health problems associated with methamphetamine use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. DICKS):

H.R. 1672. A bill to reauthorize the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act to promote the protection of the resources of the Northwest Straits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 1673. A bill to amend the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 with respect to bonus payments; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend the National Consumer Cooperative Bank Act to allow for the treatment of the nonprofit corporation affiliate of the Bank as a community development financial institution for purposes of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. FILNER):

H.R. 1675. A bill to amend section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 1676. A bill to prevent tobacco smuggling, to ensure the collection of all tobacco taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WOOLSEY:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the signing by President Abraham Lincoln of the legislation authorizing the establishment of collegiate programs at Gallaudet University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Res. 274. A resolution expressing support for designation of March as National Nutrition Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H. Res. 275. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all public elementary schools and public secondary schools should display a copy of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NUNES:

H. Res. 276. A resolution to provide earmark reform in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. CHILDERS.

H.R. 23: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HODES, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 31: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 49: Mr. TURNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

H.R. 147: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 153: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 154: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

H.R. 155: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 179: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 181: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 182: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 186: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 197: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 208: Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 211: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 233: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 270: Mr. BOCCIERI and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 272: Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 275: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 302: Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 403: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 426: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 463: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 498: Mr. CONAWAY.  
H.R. 503: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. BEAN.  
H.R. 600: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 610: Mr. PIERLUISI.  
H.R. 627: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 669: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 673: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 690: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 716: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
H.R. 730: Mr. LUJÁN.  
H.R. 816: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 826: Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 848: Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
H.R. 877: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 881: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. SHUSTER.  
H.R. 903: Mr. FATTAH.  
H.R. 914: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. LATOURETTE.  
H.R. 930: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 948: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. PASCARELL.  
H.R. 949: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 950: Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 985: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ROONEY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
H.R. 1016: Mr. ALTMIRE and Ms. TITUS.  
H.R. 1050: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. TIAHRT.  
H.R. 1054: Mr. SHUSTER.  
H.R. 1067: Mr. ROSS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.  
H.R. 1083: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 1085: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1098: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 1136: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.  
H.R. 1150: Mr. SESTAK.  
H.R. 1158: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1174: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CAO, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. MELANCON.  
H.R. 1189: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mrs. SCHMIDT.  
H.R. 1196: Mr. SESTAK.  
H.R. 1203: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MASSA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.  
H.R. 1204: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 1207: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 1209: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. SPACE.  
H.R. 1210: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1211: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1215: Mr. FILNER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1220: Mr. PAUL.  
H.R. 1228: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. LINDER.  
H.R. 1231: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 1238: Mr. CHAFFETZ.  
H.R. 1240: Mr. PETRI.  
H.R. 1256: Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.  
H.R. 1261: Mr. PENCE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 1270: Mr. SIRES and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1283: Mr. MASSA and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.  
H.R. 1285: Mr. CASTLE.  
H.R. 1325: Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 1327: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey and Mr. PAULSEN.  
H.R. 1346: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.  
H.R. 1362: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 1377: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
H.R. 1399: Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 1408: Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 1409: Mr. KLEIN of Florida.  
H.R. 1410: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Ms. BALDWIN.  
H.R. 1413: Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 1414: Mr. LEE of New York.  
H.R. 1420: Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 1426: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. KING of Iowa.  
H.R. 1428: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 1447: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 1454: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 1456: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 1466: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1470: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. GRAVES.  
H.R. 1499: Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. WAMP.  
H.R. 1505: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
H.R. 1509: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.  
H.R. 1521: Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. PITTS.  
H.R. 1547: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SPACE.  
H.R. 1550: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. HARE.  
H.R. 1551: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
H.R. 1571: Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
H.R. 1585: Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 1597: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. BARROW, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H.R. 1603: Mr. MASSA and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1640: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. MASSA.  
H.R. 1645: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 1646: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. TIAHRT.  
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.  
H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Ms. FALLIN.  
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H. Res. 81: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
H. Res. 178: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana and Mr. HEINRICH.  
H. Res. 185: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SESTAK.  
H. Res. 199: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Ms. JENKINS.  
H. Res. 209: Mr. JONES.  
H. Res. 215: Mr. SNYDER.  
H. Res. 234: Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.  
H. Res. 244: Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.  
H. Res. 247: Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SNYDER.  
H. Res. 249: Mr. CALVERT.  
H. Res. 254: Mr. ROONEY.  
H. Res. 268: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H. Res. 270: Mr. SKELTON.  
H. Res. 271: Ms. WATSON.  
H. Res. 273: Mr. LANGEVIN.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 1404, the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act, do not include any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Res. 252: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.